arXiv:1108.4536v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 12 Oct 2011

Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of interacting tunneling transport: variational grand potential, universal density-functional description, and nature of forces

P. Hyldgaard
Department of Microtechnology and Nanoscience, MC2,
Chalmers University of Technology, SE–41296 Gothenburg, Sweden

(Dated: October 12, 2011)

The standard formulation of tunneling transport rests on open-boundary modeling. Most theoretical studies of current-induced structural relaxations build from open-boundary calculations of electrostatic forces, omitting effects in the Gibbs free energy variation. A meaningful implementation of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation (BOA) for tunneling systems requires, however, a consistent formulation of forces within a grand-canonical nonequilibrium (NEQ) thermodynamic theory, because the Friedel sum rule stipulates changes in total charge and because adiabatic transformations must be so slow that they also avoid an under-relaxed electron entropy content. In this paper I recast a formal NEQ thermodynamic theory for fully interacting tunneling systems, starting from the exact electron quantum kinetics account. I identify the operator for the Gibbs free energy and I define a variational NEQ thermodynamic grand potential functional which uniquely identifies the solution NEQ density matrix. I show that the uniqueness-of-density proof from a closely related Lippmann-Schwinger collision density functional theory [Phys. Rev. B **78**, 165109 (2008)] makes it possible to express the variational NEQ thermodynamic description as a single-particle formulation based on universal electron-density functionals. The widely used atomistic ballistic-transport calculations [Phys. Rev. B **52**, 5335 (1995)] of the electron density are found to represent a lowest-order approximation to the here-presented theory of interacting tunneling. From the variational theory, I furthermore define thermodynamic forces which are explicitly conservative, given by a generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem and different from the electrostatic forces. I demonstrate that the thermodynamic forces correspond to an entropy maximization which is naturally tempered by a rigorous implementation of open boundary conditions. I find that these forces are, in fact, adiabatic as they cannot produce any thermodynamic excitation for sufficiently slow implementations of the nuclei dynamics. I use the variational formulation of the exact thermodynamics description to demonstrate that there is no inherent tendency for the electron tunneling to produce run-away nuclei-dynamics effects. Finally, I suggest that the here-described thermodynamic approach provides a more consistent implementation of forces, a nonequilibrium BOA for use in computational studies of interacting tunneling.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Gk,71.10.-w,72.10.Bg,71.15.-m

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding self-organizing functional molecular systems presents significant challenges for condensed-matter physics theory. Molecular self-assembly mechanisms provide a low-cost fabrication approach[1] which mimics the molecular-recognition principle[2] of Nature and which can open technological possibilities, for example, atomically precise production of electronics[3] and switching[4] components. The functionality is specified by the quantum-mechanical behavior of the electrons which typically respond to nonequilibrium (NEQ) conditions. It is natural to assume a Born-Oppenheimer approximation (BOA) of sorts and, in practice, we solve the NEQ electron dynamics problem for model systems or for frozen nuclei coordinates within an approximation to the electron quantum-kinetic account (QKA).[5–13] Accurate theoretical studies have, until recently, delayed the discussion of the NEQ forces which are exerted on the nuclei by transport-induced changes in the electron behavior. Nevertheless, it is a central result from the family of electron density functional theory (DFT) formulations[14–28] that the electron behavior is uniquely determined by the specific atomic configuration. Also, molecular systems are characterized by sparseness,[29] i.e., have regions of low electron concentrations. The components are free to adapt their morphology to the specific environment. To guide development of a molecular system to a pre-specified functionality, it is essential to develop a nonempiricial theory of relaxations and excitations,[30–54] in nanoscale tunneling.

A meaningful formulation and implementation of a NEQ BOA in electron QKA methods must be a cornerstone in the desired nonempirical theory of tunneling; the large ratio of nuclei to electron masses strongly suggests the general (but not universal) relevance of a suitable adiabatic behavior.[55] A careful analys is needed because the existing, equilibrium and canonical-ensemble, BOA is cast in terms of concepts (system staying in the evolving ground state (GS) and staying isolated, free of charging) which require a reinterpretation before use in standard theory formulations of NEQ tunneling. A NEQ BOA for a strictly electron theory of tunneling must be cast as a grand-canonical ensemble (GCE) thermodynamics formulation to satisfy the Gibbs free energy effects (charge adjustments) specified by the Friedel sum rule[56] and to avoid creation of thermodynamical excitations such as an under relaxed entropy content. In essence, the search for a NEQ BOA motivates a detailed discussion of the simplifications which must arise in an electron quantum-statistical mechanics (QSM) description from an assumption of adiabatic nuclei evolution.

Recent discussions of run-away and possible water-wheel nuclei-dynamics effects[48,57–61] and of a speculated inherent nonconservative nature[31,58,59] of forces accentuates the need for developing a robust framework starting from a consistent GCE thermodynamics theory of tunneling. Sorbello has presented a gedanken-experiment argument that forces in NEQ tunneling through a wire system *should* be nonconservative.[31] The argument involves extracting an atom from the wire, moving it outside the wire system (taken as the Hilbert system), and then reinserting it at another point, thus seamingly avoiding the effect of wind forces. *However,* the argument is inclusive: the gedanken experiment does not consider effects on the dynamics produced by the extractions and insertion processes. In fact, Ref. 57 points out that one cannot completely extract an atom completely from the Hilbert space and stay within a BOA, a complete decoupling will abruptly convert a resonance center into a bound state and therefore cause a discontinuous change in the density of state. A complete extraction of an atom obviously affects the scattering properties (for example, expressed by phase shifts) of current-carrying electrons. Supplementing and reinterpreting the discussion in Ref. 57, I note that the gedanken experiment[31] contains an uncontrolled description of the Gibbs free energy effects, for example, the charge adjustments that are stipulated by the Friedel sum rule.[56]

There exist clear arguments and calculations showing that modeling the dynamics of classical nuclei from electrostatic forces (used either as a complete approximation[31,48,57–59] or as the key starting point[60]) does express a nonconservative character and does lead not only to a possibility but also an inherent tendency for producing current-induced structural instabilities.[48,58–60] These findings discuss an effect beyond Joule heating, an effect which should arise also in the absence of a possible current-induced stimulated excitation of vibrations. The latter effect is clearly also important,[46] for example, as has very recently been illustrated[50] in a study of a current-induced limit-cycle behavior produced when focusing the MB interaction to an electron-vibrational coupling. However, for development of an atomistic theory of tunneling, the most challenging findings are that the nonconservative electrostatic forces (defined by electron transport) in themselves seem capable of driving water-wheel[58] effects and producing a generic tendency for structural instabilities (even when a coupling to a phonon bath is also included[60,61]). Such findings run contrary to the wide-spread traditional expectation[13,28,62–94] that NEQ tunneling can typically be analyzed as a steady-state transport phenomena because of the presence of an entropy flow.[28,66,67,95,96]

The discussions of a nonconservative nature and of inherent stability consequences of electrostatic forces[48,57–60] are very important, for example, because such forces are now in very wide-spread usage. Use of electrostatic forces has become — but need not be — the de facto implementation choice[40,41] for nuclei relaxations in the widely used (yet until now, *ad-hoc* defined) atomistic *ballistic-transport* codes[83–85] for (electron) *density* calculations, here denoted BTD. *However,* the present-standard use of electrostatic forces in BTD (or in other infinite-system NEQ QSM) calculations is *not proven* consistent with a NEQ BOA for tunneling.

The use of electrostatic forces in open-boundary calculations is an approximation which ignores Gibbs free energy interaction effects that are specified by the Friedel sum rule.[56] The use of electrostatic forces in BTD and in other open-boundary NEQ QSM calculations is sometimes motivated by a referal to Ehrenfest theorem[97] but I observe (below) that the infinite nature of an open-boundary description of tunneling makes an Ehrenfest-theorem evaluation indeterminate. Also, while there exists an open-boundary thermodynamical analysis[51,59] suggesting an electrostatic nature of forces, that analysis contains an assumption that one can treat the number of left- or right-moving scattering states (‘N_L’ and ‘N_R’) as thermodynamical variables which are *independent* from the set nuclei positions $\mathbf{R}_i$ (at fixed chemical potentials). This is an approximation which is not easy to reconcile with the Friedel sum rule[56] that links changes in scattering potential with a net change in the integral of the density of state. The importance of retaining the interaction effects produced by Gibbs free energy is suggested, for example, by zero-temperature (equilibrium) studies of indirect, electron-mediated, defect interactions.[98–102] A change in nuclei positions, at fixed chemical potential(s), causes changes in the phase shifts, and hence *concerted* changes in the total internal energy, in the charge, and in the Gibbs free energy.[101]

The central role of the Gibbs free energy is well illustrated by a discussion of a thermodynamics study of substrate-mediated adsorbate interactions on Cu(111). The Cu(111) is a surface which supports an isotropic surface state and where the nonperturbative interaction not only can be evaluated in a GCE framework[101,102] but also can be compared with direct experimental observations.[103] The formal-scattering theory framework of Ref. 101 can easily (as also summarized in this paper) be used for a straightforward separate evaluation of both the total-internal energy and of the Gibbs free energy.[104] However, keeping only either one of those terms leads to a spurious leading-order oscillatory interaction term (with a asymptotic decay $1/d$,) in conflict both with the decay predicted in a perturbative analysis[100] and with experimental observations.[103] Ref. 101 proceeds instead with a GCE evaluation (combining Mermin’s equilibrium thermodynamics DFT[16] with the Harris scheme[105]) and predicts the correct $1/d^2$ asymptotic decay of the interactions by the subtraction of internal and Gibbs free energy terms. In equilibrium this step is formally equivalent to pursuing a canonical-ensemble evaluation,[98–100,106] but it is not clear how one should perform a correponding shift to a canonical ensemble in open-boundary NEQ QSM or BTD studies. Instead the experience from the equilibrium study of surface-state mediated defect interactions[103] suggests an importance of retaining the Gibbs free energy term in an open-boundary thermodynamics determination of forces.

I stress that many-body (MB) interactions in NEQ tunneling are known to cause changes in the statistical distribution among MB eigenstates[67,68,92,93,104,107] in tunneling. The magnitude and complexity of such changes significantly exceed those arising in equilibrium cases because the Fermi-level concept absolves and genuine inelastic processes can proceed.[71,77,82,87] The Friedel sum rule is, of course, also of central importance in correct calculations of such MB interactions.[108] In addition, it is in NEQ tunneling a much more complex task to determine what possible MB states represent the lower- or higher-lying MB configurations of the emerging distribution.[67] A full, exact GCE thermodynamical account is essential to decide which such MB configurations must be excluded in an implementation of an adiabatic transformation of nuclei positions. While use of electrostatic forces does ensure a disentanglement of nuclei and electron dynamics, there is no argument that it will also avoid creating such MB thermodynamical excitations of the ensemble. It is motivated to deepen the discussion of an adiabatic nature in NEQ tunneling.

This paper recasts a rigorous NEQ QSM formulation of GCE thermodynamics of general NEQ tunneling, *thereby* permitting a precise discussion of (1) the role of the Gibbs free energy, (2) of a formal single-particle (SP) formulation (to which the BTD method for electron-density calculations is found to represent a lowest-order yet consistent approximation) and (3) of the adiabatic nature of relaxations in NEQ tunneling. The paper delivers a suitable definition of thermodynamic forces and allows an implementation of a NEQ BOA for the electron QKA. To accomplish that, the paper expresses a formally exact NEQ thermodynamic theory within the electron QKA which, in turn, is expected to contain all boundary, entropy, and entropy-flow effects in the electron system. The paper proves a generalization of the variational principle for the NEQ thermodynamic GCE; the proof follows by a straightforward extension of Mermin's analysis in his development of the equilibrium-thermodynamic DFT.[16] The variational property reflects a maximization of entropy subject to the rigorous boundary conditions set by exact QKA determinations of the internal energy and Gibbs-free energy contents. The here-derived thermodynamic forces are conservative and cause the electron-nuclei system to reach a further entropy maximization (again tempered by evaluations of relevant thermodynamic properties).

I note that the exact NEQ GCE thermodynamic theory does not provide (nor need) a uniqueness-of-density argument (as is possible in the equilibrium case[16]). However, I also note that the present NEQ thermodynamic account is developed in the same continuum Caroli partition scheme[62,63] as was previously used in the formulation[28] of a MB Lippmann-Schwinger[109,110] (LS) collision density functional theory (LSC-DFT); the appendix of Ref. 28 provides an argument that one can treat both the NEQ thermodynamic quantities and associated NEQ density matrix solutions as electron-density functionals. The SP formulation (and the expression of BTD as an approximation to the formally exact GCE thermodynamics theory) builds on the uniqueness of density theorem presented in Ref. 28.

The paper is organized as follows. The next section presents the background, summarizing the recent discussions of a possible nonconservative nature of forces to which I am here adding a perspective on the role of the Gibbs free energy and on adiabacity. Section III contains an overview of the formal results for thermodynamic quantities and a description of the nature of the here-derived thermodynamic forces. Section IV presents the partition scheme, including the Hamiltonian and the thermodynamic boundary conditions which are used in the formal collision description of NEQ interaction tunneling and upon which the thermodynamic description rests. Section V provides a presentation of the QKA and formal NEQ QSM solutions, while Sec. VI presents the variational nature of the NEQ thermodynamic theory. The linking with the LSC-DFT[28] and the SP formulation of the interacting thermodynamical theory is presented in Sec. VII. Section VIII investigates the nature of steady-state forces and Sec. IX contains a summary and acknowledgment. Finally, the paper contains two appendices. Appendix A provides details of the proof for a Mermin-type variational principle, i.e., a generalized Hellmann-Feynman (GHF) theorem. Appendix B contains a mathematical argument for formal compatibility of LSC-DFT and the here-presented NEQ thermodynamic theory.

II. BACKGROUND: FORCES, RELAXATIONS, AND STABILITY IN TUNNELING

The highly successful standard DFT,[14,15] i.e., GS-DFT, *illustrates* the level of detail and predictive power that we desire from a new nonempirical NEQ computational theory. GS-DFT rests on an equilibrium total-energy variational principle and regularly delivers accurate characterizations of structure for dense (hard) matter problems using the generalized gradient approximation.[111] In GS-DFT, the forces $\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{es,GS}}_{\mathbf{R}_i}$ on the nuclei are entirely electrostatic (hence identified by a superscript 'es') in nature and they are given by the traditional, GS Hellmann-Feynman (HF) theorem,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} U_{\mathrm{GS}} = \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\mathrm{GS}} \equiv -\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{es,GS}}_{\mathbf{R}_i}. \tag{1}$$

connecting the total-internal energy $U_{\rm GS} \equiv \langle H\rangle_{\rm GS}$ directly with the equilibrium forces.

With accurate and transferable functional approximations, the GS-DFT is ideally suited to provide a nonempirical description of structural relaxations through an equilibrium BOA; calculations of the density provide a direct determination of the Coulombic force from Eq. (1). The flexibility for relaxations and the presence of important low density regions does imply that even GS-DFT faces a significant challenge when trying to describe molecular tunneling system already in equilibrium. Nevertheless, GS-DFT has recently begun to deliver results for the even broader class of sparse-matter systems.[29,112] The presence of low electron density regions in such systems implies that the dispersive and van der Waals forces play an important role in determining the resulting structure, cohesion, and functionality. There are developments both in semi-empirical[113] and new nonlocal density functional[114–116] descriptions with accounts of dispersive or van der Waals interactions. It has become possible to obtain, for example, nonempirical descriptions of interactions and resulting morphology of self-organizing organic-molecular overlayer systems[117–119] *in equilibrium* (and as described in a canonical-ensemble theory).

However, in spite of the GS-DFT versatility, there is no meaningful application to working tunneling systems since the NEQ nature invalidates the foundation for the total-energy variational principle. A breakdown of the GS HF theorem is broadly expected. The source and extent of the deviation (of the forces from the derivative of the total internal energy) are explicitly expressed in this paper.

I note that a generalized HF-type variational property, i.e., a GHF theorem defined by the thermodynamic grand potential,[16] permits a corresponding simplification of forces in systems described as an equilibrium GCE theory. However, the GCE thermodynamics forces, $\mathbf{F}^{\rm GCE}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \neq \mathbf{F}^{\rm es,GCE}_{\mathbf{R}_i}$, must also reflect a variation of the Gibbs free energy.[101,104] The GCE thermodynamics forces can not seen being strictly electrostatic in nature when we assume fixed chemical potential(s). This is true even though the values (i.e., the force vectors) must, of course, coincide with those obtained in a corresponding canonical-ensemble evaluation, Refs. 101,106. A documented limitations[104] of electrostatic forces for a GCE equilibrium (zero-temperature) case is briefly summarized in this paper.

The BTD method[83–86] is a widely used approach for atomistic calculations of the electron density (and transport) in NEQ tunneling systems described in the standard open-boundary framework. The BTD method rests on a self-consistency loop in which a Landauer-type[64] ballistic transport picture is used to calculate the electron density from SP scattering states and in which that density is used to define the effective SP scattering potential (using the GS-DFT density functionals to describe some MB interaction effects). The BTD method is robust, as it codes SP LS solutions of the SP GCE thermodynamics problem and thus (automatically) satisfies conservation laws relevant for the effective SP potential. In particular, the BTD calculations of the electron density do reflect charge adjustments (Gibbs-free energy effects) mandated by the Friedel sum rule for the effective potential. For investigations of current-induced relaxations, the BTD method is typically coupled with an evaluation and implementations of electrostatic forces,[40,41] but as discussed above (and below), there exists no conclusive argument for that choice. The BTD method for electron-density calculations is generally seen as extremely succesful in delivering efficient, parameter-free calculations of tunneling at an *ab initio level* of detail. Existing now in very efficient codings and allowing even for inclusion of dispersive of vdW interactions, it is emerging as a powerful tool for detailed atomistic-theory studies of also molecular-electronics systems. I note that it is the emphasis on coding conservation laws, i.e., physics principles, which ensures the tremendous success and progress of GS-DFT for equilibrium systems. Since the BTD method delivers an impressive level of details in predictions and characterizations, there is an expectation that the BTD method derives from a robust, albeit (until now) not identified, underlying physics principle. This paper finds that the BTD method for electron density calculations (but not a coupling of BTD with electrostatic forces) can be seen as a lowest-order approximation for a formally exact SP calculation scheme for a full determination of the CGE thermodynamics of tunneling.

The QKA[5–13] provides, in principle, a full account of NEQ QSM but actual implementations focus on the electron dynamics and has (until now) in practice been forced to rely on empirical input for descriptions of actual systems. The formal electron QKA gives an exact treatment of NEQ tunneling in a general external (configuration-specific) potential for the standard open-boundary modeling framework. Actual computational implementations of QKA methods are (of course) approximative but, worse, they are also empirical in the sense that they rely on assumptions of a frozen external potential (i.e., an assumption of frozen nuclei positions) when used to describe actual systems. It is because of this frozen-nuclei computation approach, that we must now (separately) develop a suitable implementation of a NEQ BOA to correctly reflect the expected adiabatic behavior.

The electron QKA is very powerful and useful. Of central importance for this paper, I note that the set of QKA methods includes time-evolution formulations[120,121] and reformulations (here termed ReNQSM) of the NEQ QSM for steady-state tunneling[13,67,68,92,107] and for tunneling systems with a period or pulsed time dependence of the external field.[122,123] I note that the ReNQSM framework can be adapted for both time-averaged[93] and variational[94] determinations of interacting transport in nanoscale systems. The electron QKA also includes Wigner-distribution calculations, for example, as described in an early and clear discussion[66] of the role of open boundaries and of a need for a thermodynamical treatment of NEQ tunneling.

The electron QKA has found its most common expression in the NEQ Green function (NEGF) technique,[8–10] based on a diagrammatic approach and with an important emphasis on conserving approximations.[7] The NEGF approach has brought both analysis and methods.[39,51,53,54,62,63,65,69,71–82,89,91,124,125] Part of this formal development involves a coupling of an electron QKA with both traditional (finite-system) TD-DFT[26,27] and adaptations of TD-DFT results to infinite tunneling systems.[25,28,126] In the context of nanoscale tunneling transport, there exist, for example, formal generalizations[65,71,72] of the Landauer-Büttiker formula[64] to MB interaction cases but also warnings[67,71,77,82,87,126,127] of a breakdown for an oversimplified SP interpretation of this formal result. The NEGF methods have in turn given us a detailed characterization of NEQ interaction effects in nanoscale tunneling transport.[32,39,45,47,49,50,66,70,71,75,79,81,82,88–90,128–133]

At the same time, I note that there is a lack of a nonempirical quality in present-day electron-QKA studies which do not implement effects of NEQ forces and relaxations (except in model studies). It is exciting that recent NEQ QSM calculations, using the self-consistent GW approximation,[130,132,133] have begun to free the NEGF method of rigid, frozen parameterizations of the interatomic coupling strengths (for actual systems). Still, such (electron) calculations are not yet employed to also predict structural relaxations which results, for example, when we seek to characterize the multiple (meta-)stable configurations in current-induced molecular switching.[4]

The absence of a nonempirical character arises not only from computational limitations but also from a fundamental problem: there is no universally accepted approach to implement the BOA for systems that are out of equilibrium. A complete QKA, treating both electrons and nuclei as quantum-mechanical objects, will obviously provide an exact determination of wind forces and electromigration[30,31,52]

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv -i\frac{d}{dt}\langle\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i}\rangle|_{\text{full QKA}}. \tag{2}$$

However, the key issue is to ensure a suitable adiabatic behavior,[55] i.e. a meaningfull NEQ BOA, when using electron-QKA calculations to approximately predict the actual relaxation. The challenge of trying to thus address, for example, structural relaxations and the electromigration in an electron GCE thermodynamics determination of adiabatic forces

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{GCE}}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}|_{\text{adiabatic}} \tag{3}$$

has stimulated a sequence of method-development, analysis, and model studies.[48,52–54,57–59]

Almost all existing descriptions of tunneling forces starts with the *definition*

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{es,NEQ}}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv -\langle\frac{\partial H}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i}\rangle_{\text{NEQ GCE}}, \tag{4}$$

(where the subscript on the right-hand side emphasize that the electrostatic force is evaluated in a NEQ GCE description as mandated by the standard open-boundary formulation) and the *assumption*

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{GCE}}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \approx \mathbf{F}^{\text{es,NEQ}}_{\mathbf{R}_i}? \tag{5}$$

I note that while the assumption of electrostatic forces has recently been supplemented by terms describing the coupling to a phonon bath, it is the electron behavior expressed by the Coulombic forces (4) which are typically seen (in open-boundary investigations) as the source for a possible structural instability in tunneling systems.[60,61]

The assumption of electrostatic forces (5) enters, for example, as expressed by a choice of Lagrangian,[48] or when motivation is sought from Ehrenfest theorem[97] followed by an Ehrenfest approximation (i.e., a separation of slow nuclei and fast electron dynamics[52–54]) although the standard open-boundary (and hence infinite-system) modeling renders an Ehrenfest evaluation indeterminate (below). Ehrenfest theorem is, of course, applicable for calculations in traditional, finite-extention time-dependent DFT (TD-DFT)[134,135] and when the NEQ transport problem is recast as a finite canonical-ensemble problem where TD-DFT describe a driving force balanced by a coupling to a phonon heat bath.[26,27] However, this paper focus on the standard open-boundary modeling of tunneling and will make no further discussion of the canonical-ensemble approach. All discussion and derivations below (sometimes implicitly) assumes the open-boundary modeling framework where it is imperative to use a GCE thermodynamics description.

Electrostatic forces are a difficult assumption in a GCE description. A question mark on the validity of the relation

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{GCE}}_{\mathbf{R}_i} \leftrightarrow -\langle\frac{\partial H}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i}\rangle_{\text{GCE}}?! \tag{6}$$

must be clearly expressed in any (NEQ or equilibrium) GCE evaluations of adiabatic forces. The question marks in (5) and (6) applies in particular to open-boundary model framework for tunneling for a number of reasons involving mathematical rigor, the Friedel sum rule, and the thermodynamics which is implied by the exact steady-state ReNQSM.[67]

First, the assumption (5) lacks a formal derivation for open, infinite systems. Like Refs. 53,54,57, I observe that the force description (5) can only be derived subject to an additional assumption of an absence of a velocity-dependent force term. This is a relevant reservation for one must expect that friction effects can arise not only through coupling to vibrations but also within an electron QKA, as a result of a combination of electron-electron scattering and of the finite particle and entropy flow. Refs. 52,57,59 correctly point out that there is a need for corrections to the use of Ehrenfest theorem[97]

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\langle\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i}\rangle|_{\text{GS or finite}} = \langle\frac{\partial H}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i}\rangle_{\text{GS or finite}}. \tag{7}$$

Here the subscripts on both sides emphasize that the proof is only available for for finite systems[97] or in a standard GS-DFT formulation.[136] Reservations are formulated[52,57,59] when we have only a limited accuracy in the pure-state expansion or when working with (single-particle) scattering states[83,137] because these are not square renormalizable. However, the reservations apply equally well for MB collision problems (when there is no work around) treated in the formal LS approach.[28,110,138]

An evaluation of the Ehrenfest theorem becomes indeterminate for open-boundary models which, by nature, must have infinite extension to avoid carrier depletion. Ehrenfest proof (for single-particle dynamics) rests on using Green's theorem

$$\int_V (u\Delta v - v\Delta u) d\mathbf{r} = \int_S (u\nabla v - v\nabla u)\cdot d\tau \qquad (8)$$

and on using an assumed cancellation of the surface terms (in 'S') at infinity.[97] There is no argument directly available for a cancellation for scattering states (except, perhaps, by the single-particle work around suggested in Refs. 52). In fact, a careful handling of surface terms is essential for both the formal single-particle collision formulation,[137] for a consistent NEGF evaluation of noninteracting tunneling transport,[77,139] and for a LS collision description of an open MB interaction problem.[109,138] No argument exists for Ehrenfest theorem for the electron QKA which treats NEQ tunneling as a MB collision problem.[28,62,63]

Second, the inherent (GCE) thermodynamic character of tunneling[66] and insight from GCE investigations of surface-physics interactions problems[101–103] (as well as from the exact steady-state ReNQSM,[67,68,92,93]) give strong arguments for refining the NEQ description beyond electrostatic forces. The insight identifies a need to improve the description of the Gibbs free energy effects (as mandated by the Friedel sum rule) and to ensure an adiabatic behavior in the implementation of nuclei dynamics. Most tunneling systems can be expected to approach a steady-state behavior[25,95,96] due to the open-boundary conditions and due to the presence of an entropy flow.[28,66,67,107] The QKA naturally treats such a system as an effective ensemble of tunneling systems and the QKA correctly reflects the existence of statistical fluctuations in the electron distribution at relevant times, $t \approx 0$. The fluctuations manifest themselves, for example, as current noise.[80,140,141] The presence of fluctuations also motivates a time-averaged operator approach, Ref. 93,104.

Third, electrostatic forces will only be interesting if the assumption (5) provides an evaluation which is representative for the ensemble. However, the source of an additional force contribution with a statistical origin (for example, the electron-redistribution effects arising in open systems[67,68,92,101]) is also directly evident in the exact ReNQSM result for an effective (unnormalized) steady state NEQ density matrix[67]

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}} \equiv \exp[-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})]. \qquad (9)$$

This exact NEQ density matrix is given not only in terms of the Hamiltonian but also in terms of an operator[142] $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}$ for interaction-induced redistributions of electrons. Accordingly, it is important that the forces that effectively act on this ensemble (of steady-state NEQ tunneling systems) reflect the sensitivity of this electron redistribution on the nuclei position.[143] Moving to a consistent (exact) GCE thermodynamics theory is particularly relevant for combining an electron QKA with a NEQ BOA, for we seek a description of relaxation which mimics suitably defined adiabatic transformations.

This paper takes a fundamentally different route than the Ehrenfest or electrostatic-force approach (6) to ensure an improved description of an adiabatic character in relaxations and a better framework for implementing a NEQ BOA. Inspired by Hershfields exact reformulation of steady-state transport,[67] this paper recasts a formally exact NEQ QSM theory, the QKA, in terms of a rigorous variational open-boundary NEQ thermodynamics theory. Being formally exact, it avoids approximations which have previously been used to describe forces within a NEQ thermodynamical account[51,59] and I derive thermodynamic forces which are different from the electrostatic forces predicted and analysed in previous studies[31,48,51,52,57–59] and which have gained wide usage in BTD implementations.[40,41] Because these forces arise from within a variational theory, the here-presented (exact) thermodynamical forces are given by a generalized Hellmann-Feynman (GHF) theorem, and they are explicitly conservative.

III. FORMAL THERMODYNAMICS RESULTS

I use a continuum formulation to describe the NEQ electron dynamics in tunneling as a collision problem to ensure that the formal solution is *nonempirical.* That is, I emphasize a continuum description so that the formal NEQ thermodynamic solution permits calculations of parametric derivatives. The here-presented thermodynamic theory can (in connection with a NEQ BOA) therefore *predict* atomic-structure relaxations under operating (current carrying) conditions. Thus the present thermodynamic theory is, in principle, capable of delivering an *ab initio level of detail* (as we can do in equilibrium with GS-DFT).

This paper motivates and provides a definition of an exact NEQ thermodynamic grand potential value and a corresponding functional,

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t) \equiv -\frac{1}{\beta}\ln \mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta[H(t)-\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)]}\}, \qquad (10)$$

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)[H(t) - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t) + \beta^{-1}\ln\hat{\rho}(t)]\}, \qquad (11)$$

respectively. I denote the inverse temperature as β. A subscript 'col' is used to emphasize that the NEQ interaction tunneling problem is solved as a formal MB collision problem for a general time dependence. This approach was also taken in the formulation of the LSC-DFT.[28] The functional formulation is a generalization of Mermin's equilibrium thermodynamic theory[16] and it is closely related to ReNQSM descriptions.[67,107,122,123] The NEQ thermodynamic grand potential (11) is a functional of the class of possible NEQ (time-dependent) density matrices $\hat{\rho}(t)$. The definition and formal results are made possible by the identification of an operator $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$ for the NEQ Gibbs free energy for MB collision problems.

This paper also demonstrates that the grand potential functional (11) is extremal at the exact NEQ collision density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$:

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] > \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)] = \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t). \tag{12}$$

That is, the grand potential functional acquires the expected minimum (10) as the extremal value and serves both to identify the exact NEQ grand potential value (10) and the exact NEQ density matrix for interacting tunneling problems. The Mermin-like variational principle (12) of this NEQ thermodynamic theory supplements the ReNQSM-based variational principle defined by a variance expression in Ref. 94 and supplements the GS, action, and MB-LS T-matrix variational principles used in DFT formulations.

The variational property (12) is proved in appendix A for members, $\hat{\rho}$, of the class of normalized NEQ density matrices with a statistical weighting given by a Hermitian operator $\hat{X}(t)$ and normalization $N_{\hat{X}(t)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho} &\in \{N_{\hat{X}(t)}\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X(t)}}\}; && (13)\\
\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X(t)}} &\equiv \exp[-\beta\hat{X}(t)], && (14)\\
N_{\hat{X}(t)} &= \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X(t)}}\}. && (15)
\end{aligned}$$

The set of all possible NEQ solution density matrices, $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$ (resulting in MB collision problems) are contained in $\{N_{\hat{X}(t)}\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}(t)}\}$; the conservative nature of the QKA is, of course, sufficient to ensure that the normalization is independent of time.

This paper uses the formal electron QKA of thermodynamic to identify new thermodynamic forces which I find explicitly satisfy the adiabatic criteria of a meningful NEQ BOA. Here I focus on tunneling systems in cases where a steady-state transport does emerge, as is expected to happen in general because of the entropy flow.[28,95,96] For these systems it is possible to define the solution grand potential as a state-function, $\bar{\Omega}_{\mathrm{LS}}$. The thermodynamic forces are defined as minus the parametric derivatives (with respect to nuclei positions $\mathbf{R}_i$) of this state function,

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{GCE}}_{\mathrm{LS},\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\bar{\Omega}_{\mathrm{LS}}. \tag{16}$$

These thermodynamic forces express a tendency of the (overall, electron-nuclei) system to maximize the (electron) entropy and the electron redistribution (Gibbs free energy) by exploiting atomic-coordinate changes (thus extending entropy optimization beyond the maximization which already occurs at frozen coordinates).

I show that the thermodynamic forces are different from the electrostatic forces analyzed or used in a number of previous studies.[40,48,51–54,57–60] The here-defined thermodynamic forces are given by a GHF variational theorem

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\bar{\Omega}_{\mathrm{LS}} = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\Big[H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}\Big]\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}. \tag{17}$$

The thermodynamic forces are explicitly conservative and I show that they are adiabatic. In summary, I find that use of thermodynamic forces is guided by a fundamental principle and that they are the best approximation for implementing a meaningful NEQ BOA.

Finally, I note that the set of formal results leads towards a rigorous single-particle formulation of steady-state NEQ thermodynamics, a formulation that uses the LSC-DFT proof for uniqueness of density.[28]

IV. PARTITION SCHEME AND HAMILTONIAN

The partition scheme of Caroli *et al,* Ref. 62, allows a description of tunneling which is first principle and predictive (i.e., parameter-free, atomistic). This is true when the Caroli partition scheme is extended from the original tight-binding framework to the continuum formulation.[28,63] The emphasis on an atomistic approach, i.e., with the description of the electron dynamics having a parametric dependence of the nuclei positions, is important because we desire a thermodynamic theory specific to the materials nature. Avoiding tight-binding parameters implies that electron behavior is completely specified by the position of the nuclei and by whatever external field that one chooses to apply. Subject to a suitable NEQ implementation of the BOA, one can therefore seek to relax atomic structure and morphology to provide a parameter-free and fully predictive thermodynamic description of interacting NEQ tunneling (starting from an electron Hamiltonian).

A. Initially disconnected equilibria system

I assume, for simplicity, that the tunneling structure only comprises a left (right) lead $\mathbf{r} < z_L (> z_R)$ plus a central tunneling region 'C' in $z_L < \mathbf{r} < z_R$. The continuum (and therefore atomistic) Caroli partition scheme expresses the total kinetic energy K of the systems as a sum, $K \equiv K_L + K_R + K_C + \delta K$, where $K_{L,R,C}$ has supports which are confined to the respective, separate components (left, right, and center) and where the connecting tunneling term δK is assumed to vanish identically in the far past, at $t \to -\infty$ and to exist exclusively at the interfaces $z_{i=L/R}$ between the partition-scheme components.

Using atomic units throughout, the total kinetic energy can be expressed by the operator

$$K = \sum_s \int d\mathbf{r}' \int d\mathbf{r}\, \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{r}'|\hat{k}^2|\mathbf{r}\rangle \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}) \tag{18}$$

$$\langle \mathbf{r}'|\hat{k}^2|\mathbf{r}\rangle = -\int d\mathbf{r}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}'} \delta(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}_1} \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}). \tag{19}$$

In this second-quantization form one can easily define the tunneling term

$$\begin{aligned} \delta K = & \lim_{\delta z \to 0} \sum_{i=L/R} \sum_s \int_{z_i - \delta z/2}^{z_i + \delta z/2} d\mathbf{r} \times \\ & \int d\mathbf{r}'\, \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{r}'|\hat{k}^2|\mathbf{r}\rangle \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The more traditional second-quantization form of the total kinetic energy,

$$K = \sum_s \int d\mathbf{r}\, \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \right) \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}). \tag{21}$$

can also be used to obtain (below) an alternative formulation of the tunneling term δK. One is free to make arbitrary choices for the positions $z_{i=L,R}$, since the formal effects of the pertubation in δK (and all other interaction terms) are included to all orders.

The continuum (and thus atomistic) Caroli partition scheme assumes that each of the disconnected subsections $H_d = \sum_{i=L,C,R} H_i$ is in equilibrium at different chemical potentials $\mu_{L/C/R}$. Initially, at $t \to -\infty$, the system is described by a static potential $v_d(\mathbf{r})$ and corresponding operator

$$V_d = \int d\mathbf{r}\, v_d(\mathbf{r})\, \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}). \tag{22}$$

Here $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sum_s \psi_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the electron-density operator. It may be convenient to assume that the form of $v_d(\mathbf{r})$ for $\mathbf{r}$ reduces to a uniform background potential $\phi_{L/R}$ for $z \to +/-\infty$; in this case the values of ϕ_L and ϕ_R must be chosen to ensure charge neutrality of the initial, disconnected Hamiltonian at $t \to -\infty$ (and at $z \to \pm\infty$ in general). The initial system in the continuum (and hence atomistic) Caroli scheme is simply

$$H_d = \sum_{i=L/R/C} K_i + V_d. \tag{23}$$

I use $\{c_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}^\dagger\}$ to denote the set of operators which creates an electron in a H_d SP eigenstate (of energy $\epsilon_{\lambda,i}$) with basis in the left, right, or center regions, respectively. The quadratic Hamiltonian (23) can thus be expressed

$$H_d = \sum_{i=L/R/C} \sum_\lambda \epsilon_{\lambda,i} c_{\lambda,i}^\dagger c_{\lambda,i}. \tag{24}$$

The tunneling term in the continuum Caroli partition scheme can therefore also be written

$$\begin{aligned} \delta K = & \sum_s \int d\mathbf{r}\, \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + v_d(\mathbf{r}) \right] \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}) \\ & - \sum_{i=L/R/C} \sum_\lambda \epsilon_{\lambda,i} c_{\lambda,i}^\dagger c_{\lambda,i}, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

a form which perhaps is closer to the traditional starting point in NEGF calculations than (20). The precise formulation of the tunneling term is of no consequence for the formal analysis presented in Ref. 28 and here. The precise form is also irrelevant for the exact calculations and for the effective single-particle computational approach which is also presented and developed here.

A simple Gibbs-weighting operator $\hat{X}_d$ and associated unnormalized density matrix,

$$\hat{\rho}_d \equiv \exp[-\beta \hat{X}_d], \tag{26}$$

characterize the disconnected ($t \to -\infty$) system at inverse temperature β. The initial density matrix is a direct product of L/C/R equilibrium density matrices and the initial Gibbs weighting can therefore directly be expressed as a difference

$$\hat{X}_d \equiv H_d - \hat{Y}_d \tag{27}$$

between H_d and an operator for the $t \to -\infty$ Gibbs free energy,

$$\hat{Y}_d \equiv \sum_{i=L/R/C} \mu_i \hat{c}_{\lambda,i}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\lambda,i}. \tag{28}$$

The disconnected-equilibria ($t \to -\infty$) density matrix

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}_d}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}} = \frac{\exp[-\beta(H_d - \hat{Y}_d)]}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\exp[-\beta(H_d - \hat{Y}_d)]\}} \tag{29}$$

is independent of the value of the applied bias $\phi_{\mathrm{bias}} \equiv \phi_L - \phi_R = \mu_L - \mu_R$. I note that the interacting tunneling system will evolve to gain the correct density distribution and the relation $\phi_L - \phi_R = \mu_L - \mu_R$ is neither generally valid nor used at relevant times $t \approx 0$. The initial density matrix depends exclusively on the initial electron concentration in the leads and the pair of values for lead chemical potentials, and, formally, on the initial occupation of the central island 'C'.[28]

B. The interacting tunneling system

The continuum Caroli partition scheme assumes an adiabatic turning on of the fixed tunneling δK, of a given MB interaction W (for example, the full electron-electron interaction) and of a static electron-scattering potential $v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$ which includes the effects of the applied bias and of the set of atomic potentials. The scheme can also allow for an additional time-dependent potential $\phi_{\mathrm{g}}(\mathbf{r}, t > t_g)$, then describing a gate operation starting at some finite time t_g. The total (time-dependent) collision potential is

$$v_{\rm col}(\mathbf{r},t) = v_{\rm sc}(\mathbf{r}) + \phi_{\rm g}(\mathbf{r},t). \tag{30}$$

This single-particle potential defines a quadratic contribution

$$V_{\rm col}(t) = \int d\mathbf{r}\, v_{\rm col}(\mathbf{r},t)\, \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{31}$$

to the Hamiltonian.

In several cases in the presentation of a thermodynamic theory for tunneling, the focus will be on the steady-state regime. Here the collision term simply describes the effect of the time-independent scattering potential

$$V_{\rm col}(t) \longrightarrow V_{\rm sc} = \int d\mathbf{r}\, v_{\rm sc}(\mathbf{r})\, \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}). \tag{32}$$

In such steady state cases I will use a subscript 'sc' (or 'LS') on formal evaluations to emphasize that the results are obtained when operators characterize the steady-state situation (or that the operators and expectation values are given by a formal LS solution).

For a continuum description (which allows atomistic calculations) of electron dynamics in NEQ interacting tunneling, I investigate the full quantum-kinetics of the electrons in the connected (time-dependent and interacting) Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = H_d + a_\eta(t)\,\{\delta K + W + V_{\rm col}(t) - V_d\}, \tag{33}$$

The adiabatic turn on is described by a factor $a_\eta(t)$ which for all practical purposes[144] can be taken as $\exp(\eta t), \eta \to 0$; the original LS analysis[109] of the MB collision problems used $\exp(-\eta|t|), \eta = 0^+$.

Furthermore, to aid the discussion of an exact, effective SP formulation (for efficient calculations of the NEQ density, thermodynamics grand potential, and forces) in steady state, I also introduce the quadratic Hamiltonian

$$H_V^{(0)} \equiv H_d - V_d + \delta K + V, \tag{34}$$

where the potential term V is described by a time-independent scattering potential, $V = V_{\rm sc}$.

C. Relation to the quantum kinetics account

I note that both the original Caroli scheme and the presently used continuum Caroli partition scheme[28,63] define a MB collision problem[109] for NEQ tunneling. Traditional MB collision problems involve an approach of originally free particles to a central interacting collision region; this approach can conveniently be expressed by an adiabatic turn on, for example, as used in the formal LS formulation,[109] and in subsequent analysis by Pirenne,[145] Dyson,[146] Gellmann and Goldberger,[147] DeWitt,[148] and others.

Ref. 124 provides an excellent introduction and discussion of application of formal collision theory to condensed matter theory problems. The trick of a soft turn on of the perturbations was soon applied also for (infinite) condensed matter problems to drive the system from a well-defined initial configuration and to the physically relevant case of an interacting MB system. The adiabatic turn on (and hence the inherent collision nature) is essential for the quantum-kinetics account of NEQ dynamics[10] as well as specific NEGF calculations of interacting tunneling for it provides such calculations with a robust starting point.

The identification of operators, $\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)$ or $\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}$, for the emerging Gibbs free energy provides a link between the exact ReNQSM approach, formal MB collision theory (including LSC-DFT), and the present exact thermodynamics. The steady-state Gibbs free energy operator coincides with the operator (originally termed '$\hat{Y}$') that the steady-state ReNQSM uses to describe electron redistribution in the NEQ density matrix (9). This redistribution operator can be interpreted[67,68]

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm LS} = \sum_{\lambda,i=L/R/C} \mu_i \hat{\psi}^\dagger_{LS,\lambda,i}\hat{\psi}_{LS,\lambda,i}, \tag{35}$$

in terms of a family of operators, $\{\hat{\Psi}^\dagger_{LS,\lambda,i}\}$ for MB-LS single-quasiparticle excitations of energy $\epsilon_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}$. These operators express the adiabatic evolution (described by a MB Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_H\hat{A} \equiv [H,\hat{A}]$) of the initial (independent) states subject to full MB interaction,[67,68,104]

$$\hat{\psi}^\dagger_{LS,\lambda,i} = \frac{i\eta}{\epsilon_{\lambda,i} + \mathcal{L}_H + i\eta}\,\hat{c}^\dagger_{\lambda,i}. \tag{36}$$

This operator-based ReNQSM analysis can be generalized and it is possible to express not only the general Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)$ but also the variational LS expression for the MB T-matrix[28] in terms of single-quasi-particle excitations. A more complete account will be given in a forthcoming paper,[104] below I simply summarize the findings relevant for the NEQ thermodynamic theory.

V. NONEQUILIBRIUM QUANTUM STATISTICAL MECHANICS

The formal structure of the exact NEQ thermodynamic theory is obtained in the spirit of Mermin's 1965 formulation of equilibrium thermodynamics.[16] In fact, in the absence of any applied bias one regains the GCE system for which Mermin succeeded in formulating an equilibrium-thermodynamic DFT.

A. Collision nature of transport

The general strategy for studying MB collision problems is to formally solve for projections of the full time-evolution operator

$$i\frac{\partial\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)}{\partial t}=H(t)\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty). \tag{37}$$

This operator describes, for example, the evolutions of a MB collision state

$$|\Psi_\xi(t)\rangle=\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)|\Phi_\xi\rangle \tag{38}$$

originating and evolving from an initial state $|\Phi_\xi\rangle$. I shall assume that such initial states are simultaneous eigenstates of the disconnected-system operators H_d and $\hat{Y}_d$ (of eigenvalues E_ξ and Y_ξ, respectively) and I expand the unnormalized, initial density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_d\equiv\sum_\xi|\Phi_\xi\rangle\exp[-\beta(E_\xi-Y_\xi)]\langle\Psi_\xi|. \tag{39}$$

For a steady state collision problem one can explicitly construct a NEQ density matrix which incorporates the full complexity of the MB LS solution.[109] This LS solution

$$|\Psi^{(+)}_\xi\rangle=\frac{i\eta}{E_\xi-H+i\eta}|\Phi_\xi\rangle \tag{40}$$

constitutes an explicit construction of an interacting eigenstate of energy E_ξ for steady-state problems. Steady state solutions arise in the collision problems when the collision potential reduces to the time-independent form (32) and when the system dynamics is completely specified by $H(t=0)$. The MB LS solution (40) constitutes a projection of the time-evolution operator $\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)$, since it satisfies

$$\exp(-iE_\xi t)|\Psi^{(+)}_\xi\rangle=\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)|\Phi_\xi\rangle. \tag{41}$$

in the limit of an infinitely slow adiabatic turn on, $\eta\to 0^+$. Combining Eqs. (39) and (41) yields an (unnormalized) steady-state NEQ collision density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}\equiv\sum_\xi|\Psi^{(+)}_\xi\rangle\exp[-\beta(E_\xi-Y_\xi)]\langle\Psi^{(+)}_\xi|. \tag{42}$$

The explicit construction (42) of the steady-state NEQ density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}$ provides a direct link of the NEQ thermodynamic theory (and of ReNQSM) to formal MB LS solutions.[109] A closely related link was expressed already in the steady-state ReNQSM papers, Ref. 67,68 as discussed in subsection IV.C.

B. Collision picture of interacting tunneling

Standard QKA methods, including NEGF techniques, permit calculations of operator expectation values under NEQ conditions and must therefore provide a consistent treatment of the collision nature (38). The tested versatility of the MB LS equation for steady state problems motivates an effort to keep a corresponding collision picture for solving general (time-dependent or steady-state) interacting tunneling through a NEQ collision density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$.

Traditionally, the formal starting point for calculating the expectation value of an operator $\hat{O}(t)$ in a NEQ system is[10]

$$\langle\hat{O}\rangle_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\equiv\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\,\hat{O}_{\mathcal{H}}(t)\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}}. \tag{43}$$

The subscript 'col' emphasizes that a Caroli collision picture underpins the definition. The evaluation (43) rests on the Heisenberg picture which represents a canonical transformation of operators,

$$\hat{O}(t)\longrightarrow\hat{O}_{\mathcal{H}}(t)\equiv\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty)\hat{O}(t)\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty). \tag{44}$$

The Heisenberg picture has advantages for time-independent problems (for it leaves the MB eigenstates fixed), but it is not a natural description in the presence of the adiabatic turn found in the collision problems. Nevertheless, the original $t\to-\infty$ system (H_d) has a well-defined separated-equilibrium thermodynamics $\hat{\rho}_d$ and the formulation (43) still serves to uniquely define the expectation value because the QKAs emphasize accurate (conserving) descriptions of the time-evaluation $\mathcal{U}(t,\infty)$.

For development of a NEQ thermodynamic theory it is more advantageous to make the collision nature (38) explicit in the operators for thermodynamic quantities. I work below with a collision picture defined by operator transformations

$$\hat{A}(t)\longrightarrow\hat{A}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\equiv\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{A}(t)\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty) \tag{45}$$

where $\hat{A}(t)$ denotes a time-dependent operator in the Schrödinger picture. This is done simply because it offers a simpler formulation and interpretation; the here-presented description is formally exact. This approach is suggested by the formal steady-state LS solution[109] and it is here used for a general time-dependent tunneling case. In such a collision picture we obtain an explicit construction of the exact NEQ collision density matrix

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)&\equiv\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{\rho}_d\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty)\\&=\sum_\xi|\Psi_\xi(t)\rangle\exp[-\beta(E_\xi-Y_\xi)]\langle\Psi_\xi(t)|.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The time evaluation of the density matrix is

$$i\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}}{dt}=[H(t),\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)]. \tag{47}$$

The formal time-evolution of other operators are also simpler than in the Heisenberg picture because of the opposite ordering of time-evolution operators in (46). In using the collision picture for thermodynamic operators (45) care is taken to verify that the resulting formulation remains exact and fully equivalent with the traditional formulations of the QKA.[10] For the collision density matrix (46) the formal equivalence

$$\langle\hat{O}\rangle_{\rm col}(t) \equiv \frac{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\,\hat{O}_{\mathcal{H}}(t)\}}{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}} = \frac{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\,\hat{O}(t)\}}{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\}}. \qquad (48)$$

follows simply from a cyclic permutation of operators.

C. Thermodynamical description of nonequilibrium tunneling

The collision density matrix (46) can be expressed in terms of an evolving Gibbs-weighting factor $\hat{X}_{\rm col}(t)$. I start from the disconnected-equilibrium Gibbs weighting

$$\hat{X}_{\rm col}(t\to-\infty) = \hat{X}_d \equiv H_d - \hat{Y}_d, \qquad (49)$$

and express the evolution

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_{\rm col} &= \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{X}_d\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty), & (50)\\ \hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t) &= \exp[-\beta\hat{X}_{\rm col}(t)], & (51)\end{aligned}$$

thus identifying (50) as the emerging Gibbs weighting.

The introduction of a NEQ Gibbs weighting factor motivates, in turn, a definition of the thermodynamic grand potential

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\rm col}(t) &\equiv -\frac{1}{\beta}\ln{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\}\\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta}\ln{\rm Tr}\{\exp[-\beta\hat{X}_{\rm col}(t)]\}. \qquad (52)\end{aligned}$$

The exact ReNQSM[67,68,92] shows that $H - Y_{\rm LS}$ serves as a Gibbs weighting factor in the steady state problem. For the general tunneling problem I define

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t) \equiv H(t) - \hat{X}_{\rm col}(t), \qquad (53)$$

corresponding to a reformulation the normalized collision density matrix

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)}{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\}} = \exp[\beta[\Omega_{\rm col}(t) - H(t) + \hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)]. \qquad (54)$$

A formal evaluation of the entropy $S_{\rm col}(t)$ in the exact collision density matrix can therefore be expressed[6]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm col}(t) &\equiv -\langle\ln(\hat{\rho}_{\rm col})\rangle_{\rm col} + \langle\ln({\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}\})\rangle_{\rm col}\\ &= -\beta\Omega_{\rm col}(t) + \beta\langle H(t)\rangle_{\rm col} - \beta\langle\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)\rangle_{\rm col}. \qquad (55)\end{aligned}$$

I consequently make the natural identification of $\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)$ as the operator for the NEQ Gibbs free energy and I stress that the operator can be seen as emerging, with a time-evolution given by the LS collision picture (45). This interpretation is consistent with the boundary condition,

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t\to-\infty) = \hat{Y}_d = \sum_{\lambda,i}\mu_i\hat{c}^\dagger_{\lambda,i}\hat{c}_{\lambda,i}, \qquad (56)$$

which obviously provides an explicit formulation of the Gibbs free energy in the original, disconnected-equilibria system. I note that, irrespectively of the interpretation, the operator $\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)$ is uniquely specified by the collision nature of the Gibbs weighting operator $\hat{X}_{\rm col}(t)$ or, equivalently, of the exact collision density matrix (51).

D. Nonequilibrium Gibbs free energy

An actual evaluation of the exact collision density matrix (51) requires an explicit determination of the operator for NEQ Gibbs free energy, $\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)$. This was (with the interpretation stated above) a central achievement of the exact steady-state ReNQSM, proceeding through an explicit construction $\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}$ order by order in the formal perturbation term.[67] Here I start instead with the collision nature of the problem, to obtain a generalization to general tunneling and to clarify the explicit connection to a full NEQ thermodynamic theory.

By the emerging nature of the Gibbs free energy operator (53), we can directly extract formal time evolution

$$i\frac{d\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)}{dt} = [H(t),\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)] + i\frac{dH(t)}{dt}, \qquad (57)$$

a differential equation which, of course, must be solved subject to the (collision) boundary condition $Y_{\rm col}(t\to-\infty) = \hat{Y}_d$. For the set of operators $\{\hat{c}^\dagger_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}\}$ which (at $t\to-\infty$) describes creation of single-particle H_d eigenstates (of single-particle energies $\epsilon_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}$,) we can formally establish the time-evolution in the collision picture

$$\hat{c}^\dagger_{\lambda,i} \longrightarrow \hat{\psi}^\dagger_{\lambda,i}(t) = \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{c}^\dagger_{\lambda,i}\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty). \qquad (58)$$

In turn, the formal solution (58) provides an explicit determination of the operator for the emerging Gibbs free energy operator

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t) = \sum_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}\mu_i\hat{\psi}^\dagger_{\lambda,i}(t)\hat{\psi}_{\lambda,i}(t). \qquad (59)$$

The exact NEQ Gibbs free energy value is calculated from (59) and from the uniquely specified NEQ solution density matrix,

$$Y_{\rm col}(t) = \frac{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{Y}_{\rm col}(t)\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\}}{{\rm Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm col}(t)\}}. \qquad (60)$$

For problems with a time-independent scattering potential $v_{\rm sc}(\mathbf{r})$, and when an actual steady-state transport results, the emerging Gibbs free energy $\hat{Y}_{\rm sc}$ must coincide exactly with the ReNQSM redistribution operator,

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm sc} = \hat{Y}_{\rm LS}. \qquad (61)$$

The time evaluation is formally described by

$$\hat{Y}_{\rm sc}(t) = \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{Y}_d\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty), \qquad (62)$$

but it is alone the MB Hamiltonian $[H \equiv H(t = 0)]$ and the open boundary conditions which determine the properties of this emerging Gibbs free energy. The formal time dependence is therefore limited to the adiabatic turn on itself,

$$\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{sc}} \approx \hat{Y}_d + \exp(\eta t)[\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{sc}}(t=0) - \hat{Y}_d], \tag{63}$$

and there must be a cancellation of the time-dependence in the creation and destruction operators in (62). As a consequence, the resulting Gibbs free energy is characterized by a time evolution

$$i\frac{d\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{sc}}}{dt} \propto \eta, \tag{64}$$

which is identical to that derived for the steady-state electron-redistribution operator $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}$ derived and analysized by Hershfield and Schiller.[67,68]

E. Total-internal energy and state renormalization

When dealing with a fully time-dependent problem we obtain the exact total internal energy content directly from the NEQ density-matrix solution

$$U_{\mathrm{col}}(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{H\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\}}. \tag{65}$$

This expression has just a trivial denominator, $\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\} = \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}$, because of the unitary character of the time-evolution operator, and the conserving nature of the NEQ solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize an appearent (but not actual) difference which arises in the evaluation of steady-state thermodynamic quantities depending on whether one retains the full NEQ time dependence or whether one exploits the ReNEQSM [and the connection to formal MB LS solution via (42)]. The appearent differences are most clearly evident in the defintion of a meaningful, i.e., system-specific evaluation of the steady-state total internal-energy content,

$$U_{\mathrm{LS}} = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{H\,\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}\}}. \tag{66}$$

Because the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}$ commutes[67] with the fully interacting Hamiltonian (H), it is tempting (but wrong) to conclude that the set of initial $t \to -\infty$ disconnected equilibria eigenstates E_ξ (along with the initial thermal distribution) provides a complete specification of U_{LS}. Such a conclusion would not only render the thermodynamic description of total internal energies meaningless but would also be in conflict with the formally exact, system-specific evaluation (65).

For a steady-state tunneling problem there can be no difference between the formally exact evaluation and the steady-state description. The evaluation (66) must be a meaningful determination of the total internal energy content. The appearent difference arises because the formal MB LS solution to the collision problem implies a projection (further discussed in appendix B) of the full dynamics upon the eigenstates of the $(t \approx 0)$ Hamiltonian.[109,124,147] However, for extended systems it is then essential to also include effects of both collision-state renormalization[124,148] (which arises whenever the problem is not asymptotically free) and of level shifts[145,147] (which, for example, reflects the effects of band-structure formations on quasi-particle energies $\epsilon_{\lambda,i}$). Since the steady-state ReNEQSM, the LSC-DFT, and the here-presented thermodynamic theory make use of the MB LS projection for steady state tunneling, there is no relation between the normalization of the H_d and the H eigenstates, and there is no relation between the normalizations of the disconnected-equilibria and NEQ solution density matrices. For condensed matter systems, we have no binding of the steady-state total internal energy content (66) to an arbitrary initial energy spectra.

VI. VARIATIONAL NONEQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMIC GRAND POTENTIAL

Section III provides a summary of the central results of this paper, namely a description of the nature and properties of the exact NEQ thermodynamic grand potential. Appendix A contains the proof of the variational properties, generalizing the equilibrium results of Mermin.[16] Here I only summarize the findings.

A. Notation and motivation

The evaluation of expectation values [for a general operator $\hat{A}(t)$] is viewed as a functional

$$\langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)} \equiv \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\hat{A}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\}} \tag{67}$$

of a general NEQ, time-dependent density matrix $\rho(t)$.

For a general NEQ density matrix (electron distribution) there exists a natural functional evaluation of the entropy

$$S[\hat{\rho}(t)] = -\langle \ln \hat{\rho}(t)\rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)} + \langle \ln[\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\}]\rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}. \tag{68}$$

Similarly, the evaluations of the NEQ internal energies and Gibbs free energy

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] &= \langle H(t)\rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}, & (69)\\ Y_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] &= \langle \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)\rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}, & (70) \end{aligned}$$

are set directly by the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ and by the emerging Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$.

The NEQ evaluations of entropy, internal energy, and Gibb free energy functionals suggest, in turn, a functional form for the NEQ grand potential:

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}(t)] = -\frac{1}{\beta}S[\hat{\rho}(t)] + U_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] - Y_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)]. \tag{71}$$

This expression is a generalization (11) of Mermin's (equilibrium) result to a NEQ thermodynamic grand potential for collision problems. The formulation (71) is relevant for tunneling systems described by the continuum Caroli partition scheme.

For a compact presentation of derivatives and forces it is convenient to view the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential functional (11) as a special (collision) instance of the more general functional

$$\Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)}[\rho(t)] \equiv \langle \tilde{X}(t) + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho}(t) - \beta^{-1} \ln[\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\}] \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}. \tag{72}$$

Obviously, we have

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \Omega_{\tilde{X}(t) \equiv H(T) - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)}[\hat{\rho}(t)]. \tag{73}$$

B. Variational thermodynamics

The variational and extremal property, Eqs. (12), applies among the class of density matrices which is defined in (14). This class of density matrices obviously encompasses all possible NEQ density matrices that emerge (with conserving dynamics) in a general collision problem, Eqs. (50) and (51). The extremal property provides us with a tool to identify the correct NEQ collision density matrix (46) for a given (interacting) tunneling problem specified as continuum Caroli partition scheme, Sec. IV.

As in Mermin's analysis one immediately finds a stationary property of

$$\Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)} \equiv \Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)}[\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{X}(t)}] \tag{74}$$

which can be formulated from the functional expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Omega_{\hat{X}_0(t)+\lambda\hat{\Delta}(t)}}{\partial \lambda}\bigg|_{\lambda=0} &= \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t)+\lambda\hat{\Delta}(t)}\bigg|_{\lambda=0} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t)}} \\ &= \langle \hat{\Delta}(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t)}} \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

As in the corresponding equilibrium case,[16] this property is central to demonstrating the variational and extremal properties of the thermodynamic grand potential at the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$.

C. Extremal property as a tempered maximization of entropy

The NEQ solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$ is unique and can be identified by the minimum of the variational thermodynamical grand potential functional. From the construction of the thermodynamic potential it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} S[\hat{\rho}] = -\frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} \left\{ \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - (U_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]) \right\}, \tag{76}$$

and that, following a system perturbation, $\hat{\rho}(t) \neq \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$, we expect a relaxation because it corresponds to a maximization of electron entropy. This maximization is naturally limited or tempered by a functional for the total-internal-energy and Gibbs-free energy difference, $U_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]$.

The maximum-entropy character of the here-presented variational thermodynamic theory makes it clear that there are very close relations to the range of constrained maximum entropy formulations.[73,74,76] However, the are also important differences. While the contrained maximum entropy approaches use Langrange multipliers to specify selected expectation values (for example, the current flow), the explicit need for constraints is bypassed in the ReNQSM and in this variational thermodynamic description. Specifically, I stress that the approach does not impose a value for the internal energy or Gibbs free energy content and that $U_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]$ is itself uniquely specified by the boundary conditions and by the actual time evolution.

D. Generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem

The fact that the exact NEQ solution can be viewed as a maximization of entropy (subject to exact evaluations of thermodynamic boundary conditions) also provides a rationale for introducing generalized thermodynamic forces

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{GCE}}_{\mathrm{col},\hat{\rho}} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]. \tag{77}$$

The more specific thermodynamic-force definition

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{GCE}}_{\mathrm{col},\mathbf{R}_i}(t) \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t) \tag{78}$$

is given by a parametric dependence of the density matrix (as will be further motivated for steady-state problems in the following section). The combined electron-nuclei system is here simply assumed to further the maximization of the entropy content (in the electron system).

A GHF theorem exists to simplify the determination of such thermodynamic forces, here as discussed for time-dependent tunneling. As an explicit expression of (75), one can specify the perturbation

$$\hat{\Delta}(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \hat{X}_{\mathrm{col}}(t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{R}_i \tag{79}$$

and evaluate the changes corresponding to a derivative of the thermodynamic potential along a coordinate-line element $\delta \mathbf{R}_i$:

$$\delta \mathbf{R}_i \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t) = \delta \mathbf{R}_i \cdot \langle \frac{\partial \hat{X}_{\mathrm{col}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho} = \rho_{\mathrm{col}}(t)}. \tag{80}$$

This provides a demonstration of a NEQ GHF,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t) = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \left[H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t) \right] \rangle_{\rho_{\mathrm{col}}(t)}, \tag{81}$$

for a thermodynamic description of tunneling.

E. Noninteracting transport, link to the single-particle Lippmann-Schwinger solution

For noninteracting particles, described by the quadratic Hamiltonian $H_V^{(0)}$, it is clear that the set of SP LS solutions[68]

$$|\psi^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i}\rangle = (\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i})^{\dagger}|0\rangle \tag{82}$$

$$(\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i})^{\dagger} = \frac{i\eta}{\epsilon_{\lambda,i}+\mathcal{L}_{H_V^{(0)}}+i\eta} \tag{83}$$

constitutes the basis of what is formally the MB solution. These states and creation operators retain a genuine independent-particle nature and hence the emerging Gibbs free energy, denoted $\hat{Y}_V^{(0)}$ is also quadratic. It is also clear that these SP solutions must enter both the NEQ solution density matrix and the thermodynamics value. In particular, it is possible to obtain a separable form of the NEQ solution density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS}} = \Pi_{\lambda,i}\hat{\rho}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i} \tag{84}$$

$$\hat{\rho}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i} = \exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\hat{n}_{\lambda,i}] \tag{85}$$

$$\hat{n}_{\lambda,i} = (\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i})^{\dagger}\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i} \tag{86}$$

and of the corresponding NEQ thermodynamical grand potential. It is instructive to present a formal argument that one can derive the set of formal SP LS solutions, as a direct consequence of the here-presented variational thermodynamical description (for a quadratic time-independent Hamiltonian).

It is sufficient to limit the variational space (for the NEQ solution density matrix) to that produced by a corresponding set of mutually orthogonal trial functions $\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})=\langle\mathbf{r}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle$, each of these approximating the form a SP scattering state from H_d eigenstates of energy $\epsilon_{\lambda,i}$. No assumption is made for the normalization of these trial scattering wavefunctions whereas I use $\{\hat{\tilde{\psi}}^{\dagger}_{\lambda,i}\}$ to denote creation operators for such states with a suitable standard (delta-function) normalization

$$\hat{\tilde{\psi}}^{\dagger}_{\lambda,i}|0\rangle = \frac{|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle}{\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle^{1/2}}. \tag{87}$$

I also introduce $\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}=\tilde{\psi}^{\dagger}_{\lambda,i}\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}$ and define the trial density matrix solution

$$\hat{\tilde{\rho}} = \Pi_{\lambda,i}\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}, \tag{88}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i} &= \exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}],\\ &= 1+\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}\left(\exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)]-1\right).\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

I note that the difference between the internal and Gibbs free energies is a SP operator which can be expressed in terms of the trial wavefunctions

$$\begin{aligned}H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)} = \sum_{\lambda',i'}\sum_{\lambda,i}&\frac{\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda',i'}|(H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)})|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle}{\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda',i'}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda',i'}\rangle^{1/2}\,\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle^{1/2}}\\ &\times\hat{\tilde{\psi}}^{\dagger}_{\lambda',i'}\hat{\tilde{\psi}}_{\lambda,i}\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

The variation form of the grand potential value is obviously also separable

$$\Omega_V^{(0)}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}] = \sum_{\lambda,i}\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}], \tag{91}$$

$$\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}] = \Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}+\Delta\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}] \tag{92}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i} &= -\frac{1}{\beta}\ln\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\lambda,i}\}\\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta}\ln\left(1+\exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)]\right)\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

$$\Delta\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}[H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)}+(1/\beta)\ln(\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i})]\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}\}} \tag{94}$$

I observe that the components of the grand-canonical potential functional has the minimum

$$\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}=\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i}]=\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}. \tag{95}$$

Below, in the spirit of Ref. 149, I investigate the SP thermodynamics by considering the variational contributions from each of the orthogonal trial scattering eigenstates, $\{\lambda,i\}$, at a time.

It is straightforward to evaluate the terms in the variational separable grand potential functional,

$$\Delta\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}] = (\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\langle\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}}\left(C[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}]-1\right) \tag{96}$$

$$C[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}] = \frac{\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}|(H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)})|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle}{(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle} \tag{97}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}} &= \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}\hat{\tilde{n}}_{\lambda,i}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}\}}\\ &= \frac{\exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)]}{1+\exp[-\beta(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)]}\\ &= \langle\hat{n}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\rho}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

It follows that the variational nature of the NEQ thermodynamical grand potential can be expressed

$$\frac{\delta\Omega_V^{(0)}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}]}{\delta\tilde{\psi}^{*}_{\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\delta\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}]}{\delta\tilde{\psi}^{*}_{\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})}=0 \tag{99}$$

$$\begin{aligned}D[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}]^{-1}\frac{\delta\Omega^{(0)}_{V,\lambda,i}[\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\lambda,i}]}{\delta\tilde{\psi}^{*}_{\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})} &= \langle\mathbf{r}|(H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)})|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle\\ &\quad -C[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}](\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\langle\mathbf{r}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

$$D[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}] = \frac{\langle\hat{n}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\rho}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{LS}}}}{\langle\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle} \tag{101}$$

Since $C[\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}]=1$ (at the solution), it is possible to express the variational condition (100) simply as the condition

$$(H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)})|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle=(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)|\tilde{\psi}_{\lambda,i}\rangle. \tag{102}$$

This equation is obviously solved by the formal SP LS solution, (82) and (83).

F. Relation to standard ballistic transport codes

It is also interesting to discuss the nature of the widely used BTD approach for calculations of the electron density (and transmission properties) in NEQ tunneling.[83–85]

Again, I consider only steady-state transport in a time-independent scattering potential and introduce both a system-specific potential-energy and (mean-field Coulomb) Hartree interaction terms

$$V[n] \;=\; \int d\mathbf{r} v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) n(\mathbf{r}). \tag{103}$$

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{H}}[n] \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\int d\mathbf{r} \int d\mathbf{r}' \frac{n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|} \tag{104}$$

Both are here expressed formally as a density functional, an approach for which I present formal arguments in the following section. Of central importance for the usefulness of the BTD method is undoubtably also the emphasis on using a density functional expression to approximate effects of the MB interaction. The BTD chooses to approximate these by using the exchange-correlation functional term of GS-DFT, that is, approximations to the universal functional for equilibrium systems:

$$E_{\mathrm{xc}}[n] \;=\; G_{\mathrm{GS}}[n] - G_{\mathrm{GS}}^{(0)}[n] \tag{105}$$

$$G_{\mathrm{GS}}[n] \;=\; \langle \Psi_0 | K + W | \Psi_0 \rangle - \Phi_{\mathrm{H}}[n] \tag{106}$$

$$G_{\mathrm{GS}}^{(0)}[n] \;=\; \langle \Psi_0^{(0)} | K | \Psi_0^{(0)} \rangle. \tag{107}$$

specified as a difference between expectation values of the fully interacting GS $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and of the noninteracting GS $|\Psi_0^{(0)}\rangle$. From these functional the BTD constructs an effective scattering potential

$$v_{\mathrm{BTD}}[n](\mathbf{r}) \equiv v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\delta \Phi_H}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})} + \frac{\delta E_{\mathrm{xc}}}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})} \tag{108}$$

for ballistic transport, that is, SP scattering dynamics.[83–85]

The fact that solutions of the BTD dynamics are expressed in terms of SP LS solutions, ensures that the BTD method (for electron-density calculations) is inherently consistent, automatically satifying conservation laws. The BTD method incorporates the essential Gibbs-free energy effects as it is consistent with the charge adjustments stipulated by using Freidel sum rule on dynamics in the effective potential (108). In effect, the BTD method thus consists of constructing not only the effective potential $v_{\mathrm{BTD}}[n]$ but also of constructing and using the associated SP Gibbs free energy operator,

$$\hat{Y}_{V_{\mathrm{BTD}}}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda,i} \mu_i (\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{V_{\mathrm{BTD}},\lambda,i})^\dagger \hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{V_{\mathrm{BTD}},\lambda,i}, \tag{109}$$

from SP creation operators $(\hat{\psi}^{(0)}_{\mathrm{V,BTD},\lambda,i})^\dagger$ for the BTD SP LS solution,

A determination of the Gibbs free energy operator and the Gibbs free energy effects on consistent GCE thermodynamics forces (as described at the BTD level of approximation), is essentially already available in standard BTD codes since these codes already evaluate the scattering states (in the iterative BTD determination of the electron density).

VII. DENSITY FUNCTIONAL THEORY OF INTERACTING TUNNELING

The proof of the variational property (12) of the NEQ grand potential does not require, nor by itself provide uniqueness of density in NEQ tunneling, Ref. 28. This is in contrast to the case of thermal properties in equilibrium.[16] The emerging (rather than fixed) expression for the NEQ Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$ does not seem to provide any reductio ad absurdum argument; changes in the term V_{col} will make themselves felt both in the Hamiltonian and in the Gibbs free energy operator.

Nevertheless, the previously formulated LSC-DFT still provides a proof for uniqueness of density[28] for collision problems[150] and defines a SP formulation for formally exact calculations based on universal functionals. The formally exact theory contains the set of BTD descriptions as a first consistent but also unquantified approximation. The here-presented thermodynamics theory provides a framework for systematic improvements beyond BTD.

A. Uniqueness of density in nonequilibrium thermodynamics

The closely related LSC-DFT[28] provides an independent proof for the uniqueness of density and hence obtains a variational density functional account. The unitary evolution provides an explicit construction for the mapping

$$\mathcal{N} : v_{\mathrm{col}}(\mathbf{r},t) \longrightarrow n(\mathbf{r},t) = \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{\mathrm{col}}(t). \tag{110}$$

The LSC-DFT proof for uniqueness of density, Ref. 28 explores the time-evolution in the collision picture to prove that $\mathcal{N}$ is unique, i.e., that for every $v_{\mathrm{col}}(\mathbf{r},t)$ there can be at most one time-dependent density. Also, the case of steady-state tunneling resulting from the adiabatic turn on is just a particular form of time-dependent behavior and the uniqueness of density extends also to cases when the collision term reduces to a time-independent scattering potential $v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$. Under the assumption that a steady-state behavior emerges from $v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$ the mapping $\mathcal{N}$ is then instead completely described by the steady-state density matrix (9):

$$\mathcal{N} : v_{\mathrm{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) \longrightarrow n(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{\mathrm{sc}}. \tag{111}$$

It follows either by the boundary conditions discussed in Ref. 67 or directly by differentiating the mapping (110) that the resulting density can have no more than an adiabatic time dependence, $n(\mathbf{r},t) \sim n(\mathbf{r}) \exp(\eta t)$.

This unique mapping between density and external potential allows an explicit construction of density functionals for the thermodynamics of NEQ tunneling. I observe that it is possible to choose a detailed form of the adiabatic turn on such that it is compatible, even in a stringent mathematical sense, with both the requirement of LSC-DFT[28] and with the present NEQ thermodynamic description[144]; this is discussed further in Appendix B. A robust, universally applicable, linking of the LSC-DFT with the NEQ thermodynamics also requires an assumption of a V-representability,[151] i.e., that for every NEQ electron density there exists an external potential for which the solution density matrix produces that density.[152]

A solution NEQ density matrix corresponding to a given density $n'(\mathbf{r},t)$ can therefore be viewed as a general density functional

$$\hat{\rho}_{n'}(t) = \hat{\rho}[n'(\mathbf{r},t)] \equiv \hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col,V'\leftarrow n'}}(t). \tag{112}$$

Below I focus the discussion on steady-state transport in a time-independent scattering potential (103).

The formally exact description of the overall dynamics in NEQ tunneling also requires the introduction of a number of other density functionals

$$F[n] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n[K+W+(1/\beta)\ln(\hat{\rho}_n/\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\})]\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\}} \tag{113}$$

$$Y_V[n] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\hat{Y}_V\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\}}. \tag{114}$$

The variational character of the thermodynamical potential can be expressed

$$\Omega_V[n] = V[n] + F[n] - Y_V[n], \tag{115}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\Omega_V[n]}{\partial n} &= \frac{\partial\Omega_V^{(0)}[n]}{\partial n} + \frac{\partial}{\partial n}\left[\Omega_V[n] - \Omega_V^{(0)}[n]\right] \\ &= 0,\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

as a correction to the SP dynamics derived in Subsection VI.E. As the subscripts 'V' indicate, however, the evaluation of Gibbs free energy term (and this formulation of the density functional for the thermodynamic grand potential) must involve an explicit construction of a (nonuniversal) operator $\hat{Y}_V$.

B. Universal functionals and formally-exact single-particle descriptions

While the grand thermodynamical potential functional (115) contains a nonuniversal component (beyond $V[n]$), it is still possible to achieve an effective single-particle formulation in terms of universal density functionals. This is an important point for the variational thermodynamical theory does therefore enable an efficient evaluation for general interacting tunneling problems. Moreover, the following development of a formally exact SP formulation shows that it (partly) contains the BTD method[83–85] as a lowest-order approximation which stills retains a consistent account of Gibbs free-energy effects in the evaluation of the electron density (but obviously not when BTD is subsequently used to determine relaxations from electrostatic forces[40,85]).

I observe that since the scattering potential is a functional of the density, Eq. (103), it follows that the LS operator solution can also be expressed as a density functional

$$\hat{\psi}^{\dagger}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i}[n] = \frac{i\eta}{\epsilon_{\lambda,i} + \mathcal{L}_{H_{V\leftarrow n}} + i\eta} c^{\dagger}_{\lambda,i}. \tag{117}$$

From this functional form of the MB LS operator solution, it is possible density derivative of the variational thermodynamics grand potential in terms of universal functionals. I define

$$\hat{Y}_n = \sum_i \mu_i \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i}[n]\hat{\psi}_{\mathrm{LS},\lambda,i}[n] \tag{118}$$

$$Y[n] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\hat{Y}_n\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\}} \tag{119}$$

$$Y'[n] = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n(\partial\hat{Y}_n/\partial n)\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n\}} \tag{120}$$

and note that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n}Y_V[n] = \frac{\partial}{\partial n}Y[n] - Y'[n], \tag{121}$$

express the derivative of the Gibbs free energy in terms of universal functionals.

We seek a SP formulation where solving for fictitious SP scattering wavefunctions $\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})$, moving in some effective scattering potential V_{eff}, constitutes a complete specification of both the electron density and the thermodynamical potential Ω_V (of the fully interacting system). The individual SP scattering state is a SP LS solution which emerges from an H_d eigenstate λ, i (of energy $\epsilon_{\lambda,i}$). Assuming a suitable normalization of such solutions leads to a simple determination of the elecron density variation

$$n(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\lambda,i} |\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})|^2 \, \langle \hat{n}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_n} \tag{122}$$

where $\langle \hat{n}_{\lambda,i}\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_n}$ is evaluated in Sec. VI.E. To express a rigorous SP formulation I furthermore introduce a set of exchange-correlation terms

$$F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n] = F[n] - F^{(0)}[n] \tag{123}$$

$$Y_{\mathrm{xc}}[n] = Y[n] - Y^{(0)}[n] \tag{124}$$

$$Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n] = Y'[n] - Y'^{,(0)}[n] \tag{125}$$

where, as before, superscripts '(0)' identify functional values evaluated at $W = 0$. Using the framework from the formal derivation of the SP scattering states from the variational potential, Sec. VI.E, it follows that the fictitious dynamics is uniquely specified by an effective equation of motion

$$\frac{\partial\Omega_V^{(0)}}{\partial\psi^*_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r})} = -\frac{\partial[\Omega_V-\Omega_V^{(0)}]}{\partial n}\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{126}$$

$$= -\left(\frac{\delta F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}-\frac{\delta Y_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}+Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]\right)\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{127}$$

Since we have assumed a suitable normalization, the equation of motion for an occupied SP LS solution wavefunction can be reformulated,

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\mathbf{r}|(H_V^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_V^{(0)})|\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}\rangle+\\&\left(\frac{\delta F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}+Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]-\frac{\delta Y_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}\right)\langle\mathbf{r}|\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}\rangle\\=\;&C[\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}](\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\langle\mathbf{r}|\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

The real-valued functional $Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]$ can be viewed either as a constant potential shift or as a shift in the eigenvalue $\epsilon_{\lambda,i}$, for example, as expected when an infinite scattering potential causes a change in band-structure.[145,147]

The SP LS scattering-wave solutions (for dynamics in an effective SP potential V_{eff} that gives rise to the SP Gibbs-free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{V_{eff}}}$) is:

$$\langle\mathbf{r}|(H_{V_{\mathrm{eff}}}^{(0)}-\hat{Y}_{V_{\mathrm{eff}}}^{(0)})|\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}\rangle=(\epsilon_{\lambda,i}-\mu_i)\,\langle\mathbf{r}|\psi_{\mathrm{eff},\lambda,i}\rangle. \tag{129}$$

An assumption of V-representability is, of course, required to conclude that such an effective potential V_{eff} actually exists for a given solution electron density $n(\mathbf{r})$ of the interacting problem. However, given such an assumption, it is clear that the terms of the fictitious SP fomulation (129) and the variational evalulation (128) must coincide and this provides a framework to identify the uniquely defined effective SP potential

$$V_{\mathrm{eff}}[n]\equiv\int d\mathbf{r}\,v_{\mathrm{eff}}[n](\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}). \tag{130}$$

At the same time, and unlike in GS-DFT and in BTD, it is not so that a comparison of the dynamics specified by the variational principle leads directly to an explicit determination of a new effective potential,

$$V_{\mathrm{eff}}[n]\neq V[n]+F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]. \tag{131}$$

To search for an effective SP potential for description of MB interactions effects in NEQ tunneling we must instead require an implicit approach with concerted adjustments of both the potential form and of the associated Gibbs free energy term. Future works will explore approaches for simplifying this implicit search, as well as possible approaches to determine the set of universal functionals which are required for the here-suggested SP calculational scheme.

Finally, we are now able to discuss the nature of BTD method for calculations of electron density as a lowest-order approximation to the above-discussed, exact GCE thermodynamical DFT. It is clear that the BTD method is consistent: it is built from SP LS scattering states and it follows that the description (in itself) is compatible with the Friedel sum rule. The BTD method captures Gibbs free energy effects [to the extent that these arise in the BTD choice of the effective potential (108)] through the implicit construction of the quadratic operator $\hat{Y}_{V_{\mathrm{BTD}}}$, Eq. (109). Within the BTD calculation method, where there exists a relation between the density and the original potential V, one can also define the BTD solution density matrix as a density functional $\hat{\rho}_n^{\mathrm{BTD}}$ and, in turn a density functional for the BTD approximation for the Gibbs free energy in actual potential V:

$$Y_V^{\mathrm{BTD}}[n]=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n^{\mathrm{BTD}}\hat{Y}_{V_{\mathrm{BTD}}}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_n^{\mathrm{BTD}}\}}. \tag{132}$$

At the same time, it is clear that the BTD method does constitute an approximation in that it does not express the thermodynamics in terms of the actual MB functionals $F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]$, $Y_{xc}[n]$, and $Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]$. Comparing the expressions it is clear that a systematic improvement of the BTD method can be made by also consistently including the MB NEQ scattering effects which are expressed in the functional-derivative difference

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\delta}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}\left(F_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]-E_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]-\Phi_H[n]\right)-\\&\frac{\delta}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}\left(Y_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]-Y_V^{\mathrm{BTD}}[n]+Y_V^{(0)}[n]\right)+\\&Y'_{\mathrm{xc}}[n]\;\neq\;0.\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

VIII. STEADY-STATE THERMODYNAMICS AND ADIABATIC FORCES

The formulation in terms of a NEQ grand potential functional (above) is by construction fully equivalent to the exact solution in the QKA.[10] Specifically, a minimization of the general NEQ grand potential functional difference $\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)]-\Omega_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$ will uniquely identify the exact NEQ density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{col}}(t)$. Access to a formally exact thermodynamic theory provides a precise starting point for a discussion of adiabatic relaxations by suitably defined thermodynamic forces in the NEQ tunneling systems.

Needless to say, a full discussion and evaluation of wind forces and of electromigration is beyond the present analysis. The same applies for non-adiabatic forces (following sudden system changes) and for tunneling systems where the electrons exhibit an unstable, intermittent behavior.[96] To emphasize that I am working with steady-state tunneling where the MB LS solutions ensures an automatic satisfaction of all conservation laws, I choose here and in the rest of the paper to replace the subscripts ‘col’ by ‘LS’ on the thermodynamic expressions. While I could have continued to use the subscript ‘V’ (as was done in the discussions of SP formulations of steady-state results), I am thus also emphasizing that the following discussion of thermodynamics forces is a result which is independent of the density-functional description, Sec. VII. On the other hand, the BTD method or even a full density functional SP formulation will provide an efficient evaluation of the here-presented force description. In any case, to simplify notation, I also assume below that the time-independent scattering potential $v_{\rm sc}(\mathbf{r})$ is entirely specified by the position of the fixed nuclei $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$.

A. State functions for steady-state tunneling

I explore the NEQ thermodynamics of tunneling subject to the assumption that the NEQ density matrix (and thus all physical properties) has in fact relaxed to a steady state. To create a framework for a discussion of a NEQ implementation of the BOA, I investigate the variation in the set of thermodynamic quantities with infinitely slow deformations of the morphology (that is, infinitely slow changes in the set of nuclei positions $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$) and I inquire what forces would then guide the relaxations arising with the tunneling transport.

An exact evaluation of the steady-state NEQ density matrix $\rho_{\rm LS}$ directly provides the corresponding exact NEQ evaluations

$$\bar{U}_{\rm LS}(\mu_L,\mu_R,\mu_C;\{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv U_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}], \tag{134}$$

$$\bar{Y}_{\rm LS}(\mu_L,\mu_R,\mu_C;\{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv Y_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}], \tag{135}$$

$$\bar{S}_{\rm LS}(\mu_L,\mu_R,\mu_C;\{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv S[\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}] \tag{136}$$

$$\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS}(\mu_L,\mu_R,\mu_C;\{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv \Omega_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}] \tag{137}$$

for the internal energy, the Gibbs free energy, the entropy, and of the NEQ grand potential, respectively. The functions (134)-(137) are by construction state functions of the indicated parameters.

B. Surface-state mediated adatom interactions on Cu(111)

As an illustration and to simplify a discussion (below) of the nature of forces in GCE thermodynamics, it is instructive to summarize details[104] of a GCE thermodynamics study[101,106] for an equilibrium surface-physics problem.[103] The GCE study of the mutual adatom interaction mediated by the metallic Cu(111) surface state formally proceeds within Mermin's thermodynamics DFT by combining the Harris-scheme[105] and a formal-scattering theory[153] evaluation of the single-particle contribution to the interaction energy.

The Cu(111) adatom-adatom interaction problem is at the same time relatively simple and demanding. It is relatively simple because the isotropic surface state has an approximative free-electron dispersion[154] given by effective mass $m_{\rm eff}$. It is also demanding since the surface-state scattering off the adatoms (and hence the mutual adatom interaction) must be described nonperturbatively. Experimental observation of the Fermi-level local density of state oscillations[103] shows that while the surface-state scattering off an adatom can be approximated as having an s-wave character, the s-wave scattering phase-shift is very large, $\delta_{\rm F} \approx \pm\pi/2$. This nonpertubative surface-state scattering reflects the strong scattering-induced leakage of surface-state electrons into bulk states.[103] At the same time, the presence of the bulk-state electrons also provides a key simplification in the Harris-scheme evaluation.[101,105] We can use a general surface-physics expectation[101,154] that charge-oscillations in the surface state is almost exactly cancelled by opposite oscillations by bulk-state electrons. It follows that it is sufficient to focus on evaluation on the single-particle terms in the GCE formal scattering theory.[101]

In the presentation of details in a GCE Harris-scheme calculation of mutual adatom interactions on Cu(111), I assume that the bottom of the surface-state band is located at 0, while a Fermi energy $\epsilon_{\rm F}$ identifies the chemical potential in the zero-temperature evaluation. Following Ref. 101 I introduce Green functions

$$g^0_R(d;\epsilon) = \frac{m_{\rm eff}}{\pi\hbar} K_0(-iq_\epsilon r + i\eta) \tag{138}$$

for the two-dimensional surface-state dynamics. Here $\epsilon \equiv \hbar^2 q_\epsilon^2/2m_{\rm eff}$ and K_0 denotes the two-dimensional zeroth-order Bessel function. Since the experimental and theoretical characterizations rests on a s-wave description of the adatom-surface-state interaction, I also introduce the surface-state T-matrix

$$t_{\rm 1s}(\epsilon) = \frac{i\hbar^2}{m_{\rm eff}}\left[e^{i2\delta_0(\epsilon)} - 1\right] \tag{139}$$

for multiple δ-function scattering.[101,104] This energy-dependent T-matrix is given by the s-wave phase shift

$$\delta_0(\epsilon) = \operatorname{arccot}\left[\ln(\epsilon/\epsilon_{\rm F})/\pi + \cot(\delta_{\rm F})\right], \tag{140}$$

which, in turn, is entirely specified the experimentally observed Fermi-level (s-wave) phase shift, $\delta_{\rm F} \approx \pm\pi/2$.

The Harris-scheme evaluation for the GCE formal scattering theory analysis focuses on the evaluation of the changes in density of states $\mathcal{D}_{\rm 2s}(\epsilon, d; \delta_{\rm F})$ which arise when two adatoms approach from an infinite distance and to some finite separation d. Using formal scattering theory[153] it is natural to express this change in terms of the integrated density-of-state variation

$$\mathcal{D}_{\rm 2s}(\epsilon, d; \delta_{\rm F}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\Delta N_{\rm 2s}(\epsilon, d; \delta_{\rm F}) \tag{141}$$

$$\Delta N_{\rm 2s}(\epsilon, d; \delta_{\rm F}) = -\frac{2}{\pi}\Im \ln\left\{1 - [t_{\rm 1S}(\epsilon) g^0_R(d;\epsilon)]^2\right\} \tag{142}$$

In turn this allows a precise evaluation of single-particle contribution in the GCE thermodynamics description. In fact the Harris scheme permits the approximative $1/\beta \to 0$ (GCE) determination of the thermodynamics properties

$$
\begin{aligned}
U^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) &\approx \int_0^{\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}} d\epsilon'\,\epsilon' \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon'} \Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon', d; \delta_{\mathrm{F}}) && (143)\\
Y^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) &\approx \epsilon_{\mathrm{F}} \Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}, d; \delta_{\mathrm{F}}) && (144)\\
\Omega^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_F) &= U^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_F) - Y^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_F) \\
&\approx \int_0^{\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}} d\epsilon'\, \Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon', d; \delta_{\mathrm{F}}). && (145)
\end{aligned}
$$

The Harris-scheme and nonperturbative formal-scattering-theory approximation for the thermodynamical grand potential, Eq. (145) was evaluated in Ref. 101 and soon after used for the comparison with surface-physics experiments in Ref. 103.

C. Electrostatic atomic forces

It is possible to ignore all thermodynamics, that is, all effects of including the Gibbs free energy, when calculating the forces on the nuclei

$$
\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{es,NEQ}}_{\mathrm{LS},\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv -\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}. \qquad (146)
$$

As above, the forces (146) are identified by a superscript ‘es’ since they are purely Coulombic or electrostatic in nature. A number of papers[48,52–54,57–59] analyze and discuss the complications which arise when these forces are used to model structural relaxation in nanoscale structures. It has been shown that such electrostatic forces are not conservative[57–59] and may produce unstable or even run-away time evolution for the nuclei configuration.[48,58]

The electrostatic forces can do work and will therefore contribute to the total internal energy. However, the NEQ thermodynamic theory permits a quantification of the breakdown of the traditional HF theorem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{U}_{\mathrm{LS}} &= \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}} + \\
&\quad \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{(H-\bar{U}_{\mathrm{LS}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} e^{-\beta(H-\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta(H-\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}\}} && (147)\\
&\neq \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} H \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}. && (148)
\end{aligned}
$$

The changes in the total internal energy content is not exclusively set by the work performed by electrostatic forces.

Before proceeding, I stress that the lack of variational property for the total internal energy content is mirrored by a corresponding behavior for the Gibbs free energy state function. Taking the formal derivative, one obtains by the variational property

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}} &= \langle \frac{\partial \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\rho_{\mathrm{LS}}} + \\
&\quad \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{(\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}-\bar{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} e^{-\beta(H-\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta(H-\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}\}} && (149)\\
&\neq \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}. && (150)
\end{aligned}
$$

I note that for the widely used BTD method for electron-density calculations there does exist an arguments against exclusively implementing the electrostatic forces. Sec. VI.F shows that the BTD method for electron-density calculations includes a consistent description of Gibbs free energy effects, namely by satisfying the Friedel sum rule in the BTD treatment of an effective SP scattering dynamics (even if this is not a complete treatment of MB interaction effects). This observation suggests that it is natural to also include those Gibbs free energy effects when using the BTD result to implement forces on and relaxations of the classical nuclei under an assumption of adiabatic dynamics.

For the equilibrium problem of surface-state mediated interactions between adatoms on Cu(111), I note that the use of electrostatic forces (when evaluated in a GCE formal-scattering theory formulation[101]) leads to a disagreement with experimental observations.[103] Using the GCE surface-state description, notation and concepts introduced in the subsection VIII.B, one readily obtains a formal GCE determination of electrostatic forces between the two adatoms

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{es,GCE}}_{\mathbf{R}_i} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial d} U^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) \left(\frac{\partial d}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right) && (151)\\
U^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) &\approx \Omega^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) + \epsilon_{\mathrm{F}} \Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}, d; \delta_{\mathrm{F}}). && (152)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using formal Fourier-transformation theory, for example, as formulated by Lighthill,[155] it is straightforward to obtain an analytical evaluation in the limit of asymptotic adatom separation, $q_{\mathrm{F}} d \gtrsim \pi$. In particular, it follows that the asymptotical internal energy variation is entirely dominated by[104]

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon, d \gtrsim \pi/q_{\mathrm{F}}; \delta_{\mathrm{F}}) &\sim \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 \Re \left[\frac{e^{i2q_{\mathrm{F}} d\sqrt{y}}}{q_{\mathrm{F}} d\sqrt{y}} \times \right.\\
&\quad \left. \frac{(\ln(y)/\pi + \cot(\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) + i)^2}{[1 + (\ln(y)/\pi + \cot(\delta_{\mathrm{F}}))^2]^2} \right]_{y=\epsilon/\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}} \qquad (153)
\end{aligned}
$$

The leading-order GCE determination, (151) and (153), of electrostatic forces coincides exactly with the forces produced by the Gibbs free energy variation $Y^{2\mathrm{s}}_{\mathrm{LS}}(d;\delta_{\mathrm{F}}) \approx \epsilon_{\mathrm{F}} \Delta N_{2\mathrm{s}}(\epsilon_{\mathrm{F}}; \delta_{\mathrm{F}})$. The asymptotic decay $1/d$ of either of the individual GCE interaction components differs from the $1/d^2$ decay form derived in a previous perturbative canonical-ensemble calculation[100] and with experimental observations.[103] The full GCE thermodynamics account of interactions and forces, next subsection, is important even in equilibrium and even in the limit of $1/\beta \to 0$, when using a (GCE) formal-scattering theory,[67,101,102,106] for example, in the analysis of surface-physics interaction problems.[103]

D. Grand-canonical ensemble thermodynamic forces

I argue that for the standard open-boundary modeling frameworks iof tunneling, it is more consistent and correct to describe (i.e., mimic from an electron QKA through use of a NEQ BOA) structure optimization for a working NEQ tunneling systems in terms of thermodynamic or effective forces

$$\mathbf{F}^{\rm GCE}_{{\rm LS},\mathbf{R}_i} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS}(\mu_i;\{\mathbf{R}_i\}), \tag{154}$$

here restated to emphasize the dependence on state variables.

In a thermodynamic description, the classical nuclei still respond to electrostatic forces but the adiabatic relaxations (of very heavy classical nuclei) will *also* reflect a tendency to seek (thermodynamically) favorable electron distributions.[67] An important part of these distribution changes are specified by a correct evaluation of the Gibbs free energy effects (which exists even at $\beta \to 0$) and which are directly specified by the Friedel sum rule as formulated in the GCE thermodynamics description. I stress that, (unlike in the equilibrium case,) the NEQ MB scattering causes actual changes in the electron distributions[77,82,87,126,127] (thus significantly enhancing the changes described by a direct variation in the SP potential) and that the extent and effects of such MB electron-distribution changes will also depend on the nuclei positions.[143]

For the study of surface-state mediated indirect electronic interactions between Cu(111) adatoms,[101,103] I note that the evaluation of GCE thermodynamics forces yields an agreement with experiments.[103] For the model description of the Cu(111) surface-state interaction, and in the notation introduced in subsection VIII.B we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}^{\rm GCE}_{\mathbf{R}_i} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial d}\Omega^{\rm 2s}_{\rm LS}(d;\delta_{\rm F})\left(\frac{\partial d}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\right) &(155)\\
\Omega^{\rm 2s}_{\rm LS}(d;\delta_{\rm F}) &\approx -\int_0^{\epsilon_{\rm F}} d\epsilon' \Delta N_{\rm 2s}(\epsilon';\delta_{\rm F}) &(156)\\
&\sim -\epsilon_{\rm F}\left(\frac{2\sin(\delta_{\rm F})}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{\sin(2q_{\rm F}d+2\delta_{\rm F})}{(q_{\rm F}d)^2} &(157)
\end{aligned}$$

The latter expression[101] applies in the limit of asymptotical adatom separations ($q_{\rm F}d \gtrsim \pi$) where it is possible to use the Lighthill analysis[155] for analytical evaluation of the asymptotic behavior. The nonpertubative result (157) agrees with the experimentally observed[103] large-d interaction form. Also, the decay $1/d^2$ of the oscillatory interaction is consistent with a perturbative canonical-ensemble evaluation.[100] I stress, however, that this is an interaction result which only emerges *after* correcting the internal-energy variation for the (much larger and much longer ranged) Gibbs free energy term (144). In other words, it is the GCE thermodynamics forces (and not the GCE electrostatic forces) which in this model calculation[101] gives the best agreement with the experimentally observed adatom-interaction on Cu(111).[103]

Finally, I observe that these thermodynamical forces are essentially already available at the level of the BTD method. In addition, there exist calculations which determines transport properties within ReNQSM also using more complete (but also more complex) representations of the MB interactions.[68,94]

E. Adiabatic nature of thermodynamic forces

The state function $\Omega_{\rm LS}(\mu_i;\{\mathbf{R}_i\})$ is by construction a conservative potential for the forces (154). For a given applied bias (set of external chemical potentials) we can also vary the positions to optimize the configuration with the lowest possible NEQ grand potential value. Use of the GHF theorem (81) yields the formal determination (17) of the thermodynamic forces by the electron system on the nuclei. In contrast, there are no such arguments for the derivatives of the total-internal-energy or of the Gibbs-free-energy state functions, Eqs. (148) and (150), when evaluated individually.

In steady-state tunneling, the derivatives of the state functions are formally related by

$$\frac{1}{\beta}\frac{\delta}{\delta\hat{\rho}}S[\hat{\rho}] = -\frac{\delta}{\delta\hat{\rho}}\left\{\Omega_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}] - (U_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\rm LS}[\hat{\rho}])\right\}. \tag{158}$$

As discussed for the general time-dependent tunneling case in the previous section, the minimization of the thermodynamic grand potential reflects a maximization of the entropy *tempered* by the correct evaluations of the NEQ value of the total-internal and Gibbs free energies.

The fact that a GHF theorem (81) *does* holds for the thermodynamic forces (154) implies that they are, in fact, adiabatic. This follows because implementing the thermodynamic forces (154) with a sufficiently slow (external) nuclei dynamics allows the GHF to automatically ensure that the system is always kept at the local state-function value $\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS}$ value. By the extremal nature of the thermodynamic grand potential it therefore also follows that the density matrix must then be the actual solution of the NEQ tunneling problem (in the configuration to which the system has evolved).

The adiabatic relaxations by the thermodynamic forces will proceed and further maximize the entropy of the combined electron-nuclei systems until, eventually, the system reaches a globally (or locally) optimized maximum-entropy morphology. At the same time, the foundation in the exact QKA ensures that the GCE thermodynamics optimization is at always performed subject to an stringent adherence to conservation laws. This is exactly what we want from a nonempirical theory and modeling of relaxations in steady-state tunneling systems.

F. Conserving adiabatic forces and stability

The demonstration of a conservative nature of adiabatic thermodynamic forces also has consequences for the consistency of making a steady-state transport assumption. The finding of a conservative nature of the adiabatic forces implies that one cannot (contrary to recent discussions) expect an abundance of possible current-induced instabilities, at least not without extending the study to also include an electron-vibrational coupling.

Of course, there are systems that do not reach a steady state[96] and for which the thermodynamic state function and adiabatic forces cannot be defined. However, in spite of the ability of the nonconservative electrostatic forces to do work, I find that there is no intrinsic property of adiabatic NEQ forces (described in the formally exact electron QKA) which would necessarily drive a potentially steady-state system away from a stable morphology. Specifically, if we succeed in moving a nuclei in a tunneling system along a closed path (subject to the adiabatic property which is suggested by the large difference in nuclei and electron masses) we can expect no accumulation or depletion to arise in any of the thermodynamic state functions.

This robustness, the argument that a steady-state assumption is generally consistent, is a simple consequence of the conservative nature of thermodynamic forces; an argument is nevertheless included for completeness. The initial state (before the transformation around a loop) is uniquely characterized by the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}$ and potential value $\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS}$. Following any transformation around a closed loop we obtain a new density matrix $\hat{\rho}^f$ and a new thermodynamic potential value $\Omega^f_{\rm LS}$. However, with adiabatic transformations one can ensure that $\mathbf{F}^{\rm GCE}_{{\rm LS},\mathbf{R}_i}$ will always characterize the potential changes and that

$$\Omega^f_{\rm LS} = \Omega_{\rm LS}[\rho^f] = \bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS}. \tag{159}$$

By the extremal property of the thermodynamic grand potential it therefore also follows that we have returned to the exact same density matrix, $\hat{\rho}^f \equiv \hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}$. In other words, the conserving nature of the thermodynamic forces ensures that all state functions must attain the exact same value as the initial state functions,

$$\delta\bar{S}_{\rm LS} = \delta\bar{U}_{\rm LS} = \delta\bar{Y}_{\rm LS} = \delta\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS} \equiv 0. \tag{160}$$

The argument above applies for investigations of the electron-dynamics problem, outside Joule heating or other possible current-stimulation effects arising with an inclusion of an electron-vibrational coupling.[45,61] I find that the conservative nature of steady-state thermodynamic forces provides a robustness which is consistent with the common expectation that generic tunneling systems will relax to a steady state behavior.[25,28,28,67,74,76,77,93,95,96]

G. Variational evaluations of adiabatic changes in thermodynamic state-function values

I conclude the discussion of the here-defined conserving thermodynamic forces by completing a formal determination of changes in the steady-state entropy, total-internal energy, and Gibbs free energy contents which results from an adiabatic relaxation.

The key observation is that the operator analysis of Mermin, summarized in Appendix A, can be used to obtain the parametric derivatives of the unnormalized NEQ solution density matrix, $\exp[-\beta(H-\hat{Y}_{\rm LS})]$. For example, use of (A10) and (A13) directly leads to an evaluation of the entropy content,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{S}_{\rm LS}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = -\beta^2 \langle [(H-\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}) - (\bar{U}_{\rm LS}-\bar{Y}_{\rm LS})] \frac{\partial (H-\hat{Y}_{\rm LS})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}}, \tag{161}$$

a form which is entirely specified by differences in internal energy and Gibbs free energy operators (and differences in their values).

There is a corresponding formal simplification in evaluation of the expectation value of the Gibbs weighting factor,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}(\bar{U}_{\rm LS}-\bar{Y}_{\rm LS}) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\left(\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS} + \frac{1}{\beta}\bar{S}_{\rm LS}\right). \tag{162}$$

Using a cyclic permutation of operators in the trace yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta^2}\frac{\partial \bar{S}_{\rm LS}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} &= (\bar{U}_{\rm LS}-\bar{Y}_{\rm LS})\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS} \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}(H-\hat{Y}_{\rm LS})^2\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}}. \end{aligned} \tag{163}$$

and it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}(\bar{U}_{\rm LS}-\bar{Y}_{\rm LS}) &= \left[1+\beta(\bar{U}_{\rm LS}-\bar{Y}_{\rm LS})\right]\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\bar{\Omega}_{\rm LS} \\ &\quad -\frac{\beta}{2}\langle \frac{\partial (H-\hat{Y}_{\rm LS})^2}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i}\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\rm LS}}. \end{aligned} \tag{164}$$

It is also possible to complete a formal evaluation of the derivatives of total-internal energy and Gibbs free energy (also when evaluted in isolation) thanks to the nature[67] of the Gibbs free energy or electron-redistribution operator. In steady state tunneling the Gibbs free energy must, of course, also be time independent. The time evolution is naturally formulated in terms of the Liouville operation

$$\mathcal{L}_H[\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}] \equiv [\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}, H] \propto \eta(\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}-\hat{Y}_d) \to 0. \tag{165}$$

The Gibbs free energy operator commutes with the interacting steady-state Hamiltonian $H \equiv H(t=0)$ in steady-state tunneling problems. As pointed out by

Hershfield,[67] the role of $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}$ is to redistribute the electrons among the MB eigenstates of H, Ref. 67. Using the commutator result, $[H, \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}] = 0$, together with Mermin's observation, (A13), leads to the formal evaluations

$$\frac{\partial \bar{U}_{\mathrm{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\rho_{\mathrm{LS}}} + \beta \langle (H - \bar{U}_{\mathrm{LS}}) \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}, \quad (166)$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = \langle \frac{\partial \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\rho_{\mathrm{LS}}} + \beta \langle (\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}}) \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}, \quad (167)$$

of the total internal energy and Gibbs free energy derivatives, respectively.

Finally I note that the reformulation of the derivative of the expectation value of the Gibbs weighting factor (164) can also be used to obtain an alternative expression of the here-defined thermodynamic forces,

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{GCE}}_{\mathrm{LS},\mathbf{R}_i} = - \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \langle H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}} + (\beta/2) \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} (H - \hat{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})^2 \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{LS}}}}{1 + \beta(\bar{U}_{\mathrm{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\mathrm{LS}})} \quad (168)$$

This alternative force expression suggests a relation between the here-presented variational thermodynamic theory and the variance principle explored in Ref. 94.

IX. SUMMARY

A complete NEQ theory of tunneling must be able to reliably describe the structure of a tunneling system under operating condition and, in particular, to determine transport-induced morphology changes. This has been a challenge because in actual NEQ QSM calculations, the focus is on the electron behavior. Previous investigations have used electrostatic forces in a description of such relaxations. For the standard (open-boundary and thus infinite) model framework of tunneling, I observe that the need to include effects of the Gibbs free energy variation and a a possibility for a complex entropic behavior in fully interacting steady-state transport[67] makes it natural to move to a GCE thermodynamic description of current-induced, forces and relaxations. I find it important to consider and evaluate an additional force contribution, one which arises from the sensitivity of the NEQ electron distribution to the scattering potential, i.e., the nuclei positions.[67] This force contribution describe Gibbs free energy effects which are essential to satisfy the Friedel sum rule.

To deliver a description of such effective forces, this paper recasts a rigorous GCE thermodynamic description which is based on formal (electron) QKA[10] and which is closely related to the exact steady-state ReNQSM.[67] Specifically, this paper formulates a functional for the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential. In part, this result is made possible by a definition of an operator for the NEQ Gibbs free energy under general NEQ tunneling conditions. The paper demonstrates a variational property of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential as a straightforward generalization of Mermin's previous results for equilibrium thermodynamics.[16] The paper furthermore demonstrates that using the uniqueness of density proof of the LSC-DFT[28] permits the formulation of the exact NEQ thermodynamic theory in terms of density functionals.

I derive exact thermodynamic forces, that is, effective forces which describe the behavior of the ensemble that characterizes the NEQ tunneling system. The thermodynamic forces are different from the electrostatic forces, satisfy a GHF theorem, and are thus explicitly conservative. The paper demonstrates that these themodynamics forces are adiabatic.

In conclusion, I propose that use of the here-derived conservative, adiabatic thermodynamic forces constitutes a more correct and natural implementation of the BOA for use with a NEQ electron QKA of tunneling. This because the GCE thermodynamics forces are consistent with the Friedel sum rule and because the adiabatic nature suggests that the thermodynamic forces will provide a better modeling of the actual relaxations of morphology which arise under operating condition.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful and thankful to David C. Langreth (who, sadly, is no longer with us) for interest and for input far beyond Ref. 124. The author also gratefully acknowledges discussions with Selman P. Hershfield and Gerald D. Mahan. The research was supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR).

Appendix A: Mermin-type variational thermodynamics for nonequilibrium tunneling

This section presents a summary of the proof of the variational nature of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential and of the global-minimum property of the exact (solution) NEQ collision density matrix. The arguments are in many ways a straightforward generalization of Mermin's proof[16] for corresponding properties of the equilibrium thermodynamic theory. The generalizations applies for time-independent or time-dependent interacting tunneling systems under NEQ conditions defined as a collision problem, Sec. IV. The proof of the variational property is only summarized here with weight given to a detail that differs slightly from the equilibrium case.

The first observation is that it is sufficient to proof the extremal property for any given time and hence I shall suppress all mentioning of subscripts 'col', 'sc', or 'LS' (as well as possible temporal argument) in the following. A more compressed formulation of the extremal properties of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential, the NEQ variational property can thus be formulated

$$\Omega[\hat{\rho}] > \Omega[\hat{\rho}_0] \equiv \Omega_0 \quad (A1)$$

where (for a Hermitian $\hat{X}_0$)

$$\hat{\rho}_0 \equiv \frac{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_0}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_0}\}} \tag{A2}$$

$$\Omega_0 \equiv -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln(\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_0}\}), \tag{A3}$$

$$\Omega[\hat{\rho}] \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}[X_0 + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho}]\} \tag{A4}$$

and where trial NEQ density matrices

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{e^{-\beta \hat{X}}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}}\}} \tag{A5}$$

are given by any Hermitian operator $\hat{X}$.

As in the equilibrium theory, it is advantageous to also define a set of intermediate density matrices

$$\hat{\rho}_\lambda \equiv \frac{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_\lambda}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_\lambda}\}}, \tag{A6}$$

$$\hat{X}_\lambda \equiv \hat{X}_0 + \lambda \Delta, \tag{A7}$$

where $\Delta \equiv -(1/\beta)\ln(\hat{\rho}) - \hat{X}_0$. This family of possible NEQ density matrices (A6) form a line between $\hat{\rho}_0$ and $\hat{\rho}$ where each member formally represents (in the notation introduced in Sec. VI) a solution of the thermodynamic grand potential

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\hat{X}_\lambda} &\equiv \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_\lambda}(\hat{X}_\lambda + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho}_\lambda)\}}{\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_\lambda}\}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln(\mathrm{Tr}\{e^{-\beta \hat{X}_\lambda}\}) \neq \Omega[\hat{\rho}_\lambda]. \end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

I note that, unlike in the equilibrium case, a separate argument (for example, V-representability) would be needed to conclude that any given member, $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$ (of the line of density-matrices) corresponds to an actual density matrix solution for a physical NEQ tunneling system. However, such a representability assumption is not of any consequence for the proof and discussion of the extremal nature of the NEQ thermodynamic theory. The essential observation is that all of the intermediate NEQ density matrices (A6) are still specified in the form given in Eq. (A5).

The central step in the proof and argument is a demonstration of the variational property,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \Omega_{\hat{X}_\lambda} = \mathrm{Tr}\{\Delta \hat{\rho}_\lambda\}, \tag{A9}$$

that is, a compact formulation of the generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem (81). Here the key observation is the general operator identity[16]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} e^{-\beta(\hat{X}+\lambda\Delta)} = -e^{-\beta(\hat{X}+\lambda\Delta)} \int_0^\beta d\beta' \Delta_\lambda(\beta') \tag{A10}$$

$$\Delta_\lambda(\beta') \equiv e^{\beta'(\hat{X}+\lambda\Delta)}\, \Delta \, e^{-\beta(\hat{X}+\lambda\Delta)}, \tag{A11}$$

which, of course, applies irrespectively of the nature of the statistical ensemble, for NEQ and equilibirum conditions alike. Introducing also $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_\lambda \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_\lambda \hat{O}\}$, one can thus formulate the parametric density matrix changes,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \hat{\rho}_\lambda = -\int_0^\beta d\beta' \hat{\rho}_\lambda [\Delta_\lambda(\beta') - \langle \Delta \rangle_\lambda], \tag{A12}$$

Mermin also makes the observation that a cyclic permutation of operators permits a significant simplification in the evaluation of expectation values, for example,[16]

$$\langle \Delta_\lambda(\beta') \rangle_\lambda = \langle \Delta \rangle_\lambda. \tag{A13}$$

Inserting this result in (A12) completes an explicit demonstration of the generalized Hellmann-Feynman result (A9).

Finally, from (A10) also follows a proof for the extremal nature of the thermodynamical grand potential. It proceeds by the reformulation of the potential derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \Omega[\hat{\rho}_\lambda] = -\lambda \mathrm{Tr}\{\Delta \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \hat{\rho}_\lambda\} \tag{A14}$$

$$= \lambda \int_0^\beta d\beta' |\langle \Delta_\lambda(\beta/2) - \langle \Delta \rangle_\lambda \rangle|^2. \tag{A15}$$

As in equilibrium thermodynamics, this results is sufficient to ensure that the difference $\Omega[\hat{\rho}] - \Omega[\hat{\rho}_0]$ is positive and cannot vanish except when $\hat{\rho} \equiv \hat{\rho}_0$.

In summary, the operator analysis of Mermin[16] is sufficient to ensure (not only for the equilibrium case but also for the present NEQ thermodynamics) that the thermodynamic grand potential is both variational and extremal at the exact solution $\hat{\rho}_0$.

Appendix B: Linking LSC-DFT and the quantum kinetics accounts of tunneling

The choice of the continuum Caroli partition scheme is designed to allow a combination of the LSC-DFT[28] with the present general NEQ thermodynamic account. To accomplish that, it is necessary to also ensure that the choice of details in the adiabatic turn (for the electron QKA) is made such that it permits the LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density. The underlying issue is purely technical, but for completeness, I include here a mathematical analysis.

While Ref. 28 never explicitly stated this, the formal LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density does, in principle, require that the adiabatic-turn-on factor $a_\eta(t)$ vanishes not only at $t \to -\infty$, but also for all times $t < t_0$ where $t_0 \to -\infty$. In a strict mathematical sense, this is necessary because the LSC-DFT proof implicitly assumes one can work with a Taylor expansion in the temporal evolution. With the simple adiabatic turn on $[\tilde{a}_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t)]$ that we normally employ in the QKA, it follows that all Taylor-expansion coefficients of the temporal evolution vanish in the limit $t \to -\infty$. It is clear, that alone an extremely soft modification of the adiabatic turn on is required to ensure a rigorous mathematical description in the LSC-DFT analysis. It is also clear (because of the entropy flow) that such an extremely soft modification of the adiabatic turn on can have no consences for the tunneling dynamics at relevant time, for example, as expressed in the steady-state LS solution to the MB collision problem. The argument can be made formal.

To be specific I investigate adiabatic turn off which [instead of the standard LS or QKA form, $\tilde{a}_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t)$] is identically zero until some far away time $t_0 \to -\infty$. I assume that $a_\eta(t > t_0)$ is real, monotonously increasing, and satisfies $0 \leq a_\eta(t) \leq 1$, with a bounded derivative $(da_\eta/dt) \leq \eta a_\eta(t)$. An explicit choice of slightly modified adiabatic turn on factors can be expressed

$$a_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t) b_\eta(t; t_0^\eta, t_1^\eta) \tag{B1}$$

where I have introduced a monotonously increasing positive function $b_\eta(t; t_0^\eta, t_1^\eta)$ with $b_\eta(t < t_0^\eta) \equiv 0$, $b_\eta(t > t_1^\eta) \equiv 1$ and $db_\eta(t)/dt \ll \eta$. I choose $t_1^\eta = -\eta^{-(\alpha+1)}$ (with $\alpha \to \infty$) and $t_0^\eta = t_1^\eta/\eta^2$. I note that this set of choices removes any possible $t = -\infty$ singularities in the LCS-DFT proof of uniqueness of density and I proceed to demonstrate that this modified adiabatic turn on still leaves all details of the formal LS solutions in the QKA unchanged (in the relevant limit $\eta \to 0^+$).

The important fact is that $da_\eta(t)/dt$ remains essentially specified by $\eta \exp(\eta t)$ since this factor, in turn, determines the denominator in the formal MB LS solution (40). I introduce

$$\hat{f}_\xi(t) \equiv e^{-i(E_\xi - H + i\eta)t} \tag{B2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_\xi(t) &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \hat{f}_\xi(t') \\ &= \frac{i}{E_\xi - H + i\eta} e^{-i(H - E_\xi + i\eta)t} \end{aligned} \tag{B3}$$

and note that the boundary conditions, i.e., the original choice of adiabatic turn on $\exp(\eta t)$, enters the MB LS solution through the formal evaluation[109,147]

$$|\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \eta \hat{F}_\xi(0) |\Phi_\xi\rangle. \tag{B4}$$

Using instead the present collision picture with slightly modified adiabatic turn on (B1), the boundary conditions instead enters the formal MB solution through

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} dt' \hat{f}_\xi(t') b_\eta(t') = \hat{F}_\xi(t=0) - \hat{B}_\xi(\eta) \tag{B5}$$

$$\hat{B}_\xi(\eta) = \int_{t_0^\eta}^{t_1^\eta} dt' \hat{F}_\xi(t') \frac{db_\eta}{dt}(t'), \tag{B6}$$

as obtained by partial integration. The resulting LS solution therefore has the form

$$|\bar{\Psi}_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = |\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle - |\delta\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle, \tag{B7}$$

$$|\delta\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \eta \hat{B}_\xi(\eta) |\Phi_\xi\rangle. \tag{B8}$$

However, the relative normalization of the additional term in the modified MB LS solution (B8) is strongly bonded,

$$\left\| |\delta\bar{\Psi}_\xi^{(+)}\rangle \right\| \ll \eta \int_{t_0^\eta}^{t_1^\eta} dt' \left\| \eta e^{\eta t'} \hat{F}_\xi(0) |\Phi_\xi\rangle \right\|, \tag{B9}$$

$$< \mathcal{B}(\eta) \left\| |\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle \right\|, \tag{B10}$$

by the (state-independent) evaluation

$$\mathcal{B}(\eta) \equiv \exp(\eta t_1^\eta) = \exp[-(1/\eta)^\alpha] \to 0 \tag{B11}$$

The choice $t_1^\eta = \eta^{-(\alpha+1)}$ with $\alpha \to \infty$ certainly ensures that $\mathcal{B}(\eta)$ and hence the modification (B8) of the LS solution become irrelevant in the limit $\eta \to 0^+$.

In summary, I find that the LSC-DFT analysis[28] can be adapted to provide an independent proof for uniqueness of density while leaving the formal LS solutions of the MB collision problems unchanged. This opens for a density functional formulation of the NEQ thermodynamic quantities in a description which resembles the equilibrium case presented in Ref. 16.

---

[1] For example, based on DNA sequencing that programs and controls three-dimensional organization of DNA-coated gold nanoparticles, D. Nykapanchuk *et al*, Nature **451**, 549 (2008); S.Y. Park *et al*, Nature **451**, 553 (2008).

[2] For example, S.H. Gellman, Chem. Rev. **97**, 1231 (1997); P.J. Edmonson *et al*, Int. J. Mod. Sci. **9**, 154 (2008).

[3] For example, M. A. Rattner and A. Nitzan, Science **300**, 1384 (2003); S. Pan, Q. Fu, T. Huang, A. Zhao, B. Wang, J. Yang, and J. Hou, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **8**, 15259 (2009).

[4] For example, J. Chen, M. A. Reed, A.M. Rawlett, and J.M. Tour, Science **286**, 1550 (1999).

[5] P. G. Bergmann and J. L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. **99**, 578 (1955); J. L. Lebowitz and P. G. Bergmann, Ann. Phys. **1**, 1 (1957).

[6] U. Fano, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 74 (1957).

[7] G. Baym and L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Rev. **124**, 287 (1961); G. Baym, Phys. Rev. **127**, 1391 (1962).

[8] L. P. Kadanoff and G. Baym, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1962).

[9] L. V. Keldysh, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **47**, 1515 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 1018 (1965)].

[10] D. C. Langreth, *1975 NATO Advanced Study Institute on Linear and Nonlinear Transport in Solids, Antwerpen, 1975* (Plenum Press, New York, 1976), Vol B17, pp. 2-32; D. C. Langreth and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **6**, 3189 (1972).

[11] G. D. Mahan, Phys. Rep. **145**, 251 (1987).

[12] M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 6104 (1991).

[13] W. Grandy, *Foundations of Statistical Mechanics: Volume II: Nonequilibrium Phenomena,* (Springer, New York, 1988).,

[14] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964).

[15] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).

[16] N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. **137**, A1441 (1965).

[17] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 997 (1984).

[18] E. K. U. Gross and W. Kohn, Adv. Quantum Chem. **21**, 55 (1990).

[19] T.-C. Li and P.-Q. Tong, Phys. Rev. A **31**, 1950 (1985)

[20] G. Vignale and M. Rasolt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2360 (1987).

[21] DFT has also been generalized to a relativistic description, E. Engels and R. M. Dreizler in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), pp. 1-80.

[22] The action principle of time-dependent DFT can also be used for a formulation of transport within a Liouvillean formulation, A. K. Rajagopal and F. A. Bout, in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), pp. 173-209.

[23] G. Vignale and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 2037 (1996); G. Vignale, C. A. Ullrich, and S. Conti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4878 (1997); C. A. Ullrich and G. Vignale, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 245102 (2002).

[24] M. Lüders, M. A. L. Marques, N. N. Lathiotakis, A. Floris, G. Profeta, L. Fast, A. Continenza, S. Massidda, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 024545 (2005); M. A. L. Marques, M. Lüders, N. N. Lathiotakis, G. Profeta, A. Floris, L. Fast, A. Continenza, E. K. U. Gross and S. Massidda, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 024546 (2005).

[25] G. Stefanucci and C.-O. Almbladh, Europhys. Lett. **67**, 14 (2004); G. Stefanucci and C.-O. Almbladh, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 195318 (2004); S. Kurth, G. Stefanucci, C.-O. Almbladh, A. Rubio, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 035308 (2005).

[26] R. Gebauer and R. Car, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 160404 (2004); R. Gebauer and R. Car, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 125324 (2004).

[27] K. Burke, R. Car, and R. Gebauer Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 146803 (2005); M. Koentopp, C. Chang, K. Burke, and R. Car, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **20**, 083203 (2008).

[28] P. Hyldgaard, Phys. Rev B **78**, 165109 (2008).

[29] D.C. Langreth, B. I. Lundqvist, S. D. Chakarova-Käck, V. R. Cooper, M. Dion, P. Hyldgaard, A. Kelkkanen, J. Kleis, L. Kong, S. Li, P. G. Moses, E. Murray, A. Puzder, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, and T. Thonhauser, J. Phys.:Condens.Matter **21**, 084203 (2009).

[30] For example, as summarized in H. Yasuda and A. Sakai, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 1069 (1997).

[31] R. S. Sorbello in H. Ehrenreich and F. Spaepen, eds. *Solid State Phys.* (Academic Press, New York, 1997) **51**, pp. 159-231.

[32] J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **1**, 2110 (1970); J. W. Gadzuk and S. Holloway, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 4298 (1986); J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 13466 (1991); J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 12832 (1993); J. W. Gadzuk, Surf. Sci. **342**, 345 (1995).

[33] P.Kumar and R. S. Sorbello, Thin Solid Films **25**, 25 (1975).

[34] L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3142 (1975).

[35] R. S. Sorbello and B. B. Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 2196 (1980).

[36] B. N. J. Persson and M. Persson, Surf. Sci. **97**, 609 (1980); B. N. J. Persson and M. Persson, Sol. State Comm. **36**, 175 (1980); M. Persson and B. Hellsing, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 662 (1982).

[37] B. C. Stipe, M. A. Rezaei, W. Ho, S. Gao, M. Persson, and B. I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4410 (1997); S. W. Gao, M. Persson, and B. I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 4825 (1997); N. Lorente and M. Persson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2997 (2000); N. Lorente, M. Persson, L. J. Lauhon, and W. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2593 (2001).

[38] M. Brandbyge, J. Schiøtz, M. R. Sørensen, P. Stoltze, K. W. Jacobsen, J. K. Nørskov, L. Olesen, E. Laegsgaard, I. Stensgaard, and F. Besenbacher, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 8499 (1995); M. R. Sørensen, M. Brandbyge, and K. W. Jacobsen, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 3283 (1998).

[39] M. Plihal and J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 085404 (2001); J. W. Gadzuk and M. Plihal, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 235413 (2003).

[40] M. DiVentra, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 046801 (2002).

[41] M. Brandbyge, K. Stokbro, J. Taylor, J. L. Mozos, and P. Ordejón, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 193104 (2003).

[42] Both Ref. 40 and Ref. 41 report calculations as well as details of efficient code implementations of an approximative nonempirical description of nanoscale transport and current-induced structural relaxations starting from an assumption of electrostatic forces. The starting point for such force evaluations and structural implementations is here the electron density variation calculated in the highly efficient and widely used BTD method[83–86] for electron-density calculations. Among a number of formal results, this paper also delivers a framework for efficient SP evaluation of thermodynamical properties in NEQ tunneling, a approach for which the BTD method (but not the use of electrostatic forces) can be seen as a lowest-order yet consistent approximations.

[43] The nanopipette is an explicit demonstration (by in-situ experiments) that electron currents cause matter transport in a nanoscale system, K. Svensson, H. Olin, and E. Olsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 145901 (2004).

[44] Switching in tunneling systems can be investigated from within a description of the electron-phonon coupling on the transport, M. Brandbyge and P. Hedegård, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2919 (1994).

[45] A possible mechanism for frequency-selective control of current-induced vibrational excitations in tunneling is described in P. Hyldgaard, Low Temp. Phys. **27**, 585 (2001); Mat. Sci. Eng. C **23**, 243 (2003).

[46] It is, in principle, possible for current-induced stimulation of vibrations to create a phaser, or phonon-laser effect which obviously goes beyond Joule heating. Ref. 45 finds that causality (expressed in a NEGF formulation of such current-induced excitations) does ensure that the net stimulated transitions must lead to an adsorption in the generic (single-level) NEQ tunneling cases. To create a would-be run-away nuclei dynamics through a phaser

mechanism it seems necessary to carefully engineer the tunneling transport (much like what has, of course, already been done for photon transitions in solid-state lasers).

[47] T. Frederiksen, M. Paulsson, M. Brandbyge, and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 205413 (2007).

[48] C. Verdozzi, G. Stefanucci, C.-O. Almbladh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 046603 (2006).

[49] Y. F. Wang, J. Kröger, R. Berndt, H. Vazquez, M. Brandbyge, and M. Paulsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 176802 (2010).

[50] N. Bode, S. V. Kusminskiy, R. Egger, and F. von Oppen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 036804 (2011).

[51] T. N. Todorov, J. Hoekstra, and A. P. Sutton, Phil. Mag. B **80**, 421 (2000); A. P. Sutton and T. N. Todorov, Mol. Phys. **102**, 919 (2004).

[52] M. DiVentra and S. T. Pantelides, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 16207 (2000).

[53] T. N. Todorov, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **13**, 10125 (2001);

[54] T. N. Todorov, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **14**, 3049 (2002).

[55] Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XVII, section 13, and Chapter XVIII, sections 14-16.

[56] See, for example, S. Doniach and E. H. Sonnheimer, *Green's Functions for Solid State Physicists*, (W. A. Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1974), pp. 78-85.

[57] M. DiVentra, Y.-C. Chen, and T. N. Todorov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 176803 (2004).

[58] D. Dundas, E. J. McEniry, and T. N. Todorov, Nature Nanotech. **4**, 99 (2009).

[59] T. N. Todorov, D. Dundas, and E.J. McEniry, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 075416 (2010).

[60] J.-T. Lü, M. Brandbyge, and P. Hedegård, Nano Lett. **10**, 1657 (2010); details on the current description are given in the supplementary material.

[61] Including an electron-phonon coupling will obviously provide a modeling of Joule heating of the lattice and, hence, of a friction mechanism. However, it also opens up for both possible topological effects[60] and frequency-selective, current-induced spontaneous emission as well as stimulated transistions.[45,46]

[62] C. Caroli, R. Combescot, P. Nozieres, and D. Saint-James, J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys. **4**, 916 (1971); C. Caroli, R. Combescot, P. Nozieres and D. Saint-James, J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys. **5**, 21 (1972).

[63] A corresponding continuum version (often termed partition free because the introduction of an initial separation is arbitrary and can have no resulting effect when treating the corresponding formal perturbation to all orders) of the Caroli computational framework[62] is presented in T. E. Feuchtwang, Phys. Rev. B, **10**, 4121 (1974).

[64] R. Landauer, IBM J. Res. Dev. **1**, 233 (1957); M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1761 (1986).

[65] H. U. Baranger and A. D. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 8169 (1989).

[66] W. R. Frensley, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 745 (1990).

[67] S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2134 (1993).

[68] A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. B **51**, R12896 (1995); A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 14978 (1998).

[69] S. Datta, J. Phys.:Condens.Matter **2**, 8023 (1990).

[70] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3048 (1991).

[71] S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3720 (1991); S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 7046 (1992); S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 7061 (1992); J. W. Wilkins, S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, P. Hyldgaard, and C. J. Stanton, Physica Scripta **T42**, 115 (1992).

[72] Y. Meir and N. S. Wingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2512 (1992).

[73] T. K. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1018 (1992).

[74] O. Heinonen and M. D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1447 (1993).

[75] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2601 (1993).

[76] P. Bokes and R. W. Godby, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 125414 (2003); P. Bokes, H. Mera, and R. W. Godby, Phys. Rev. B**72**, 165425 (2005).

[77] J. H. Davies, S. Hershfield, P. Hyldgaard, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 4603 (1993); P. Hyldgaard and B. I. Lundqvist, Sol. State Comm. **116**, 569 (2000).

[78] N. S. Wingreen, K. W. Jacobsen, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1396 (1988); N. S. Wingreen, K. W. Jacobsen, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 11834 (1989).

[79] E. V. Anda and F. Flores, J. Phys.;Condens. Mat. **3**, 9087 (1991); R. Lake, G. Klimeck, S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 6427 (1993); E. Runge and H. Ehrenreich, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 9145 (1992); E. Runge and H. Ehrenreich, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **219**, 55 (1992); C. H. Grein, E. Runge, H. Ehrenreich, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 12590 (1993).

[80] G. B. Lesovik, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **49**, 513 (1989) [JETP Lett. **49**, 592 (1989)]; B. Yurke and G. P. Kochanski, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 8184 (1990); M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2901 (1990); R. Landauer and T. Martin, Physica B **175**, 167 (1991).

[81] E. Runge, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 2003 (1993).

[82] For examples of NEGF studies which determine and discuss the effects of the electron-vibrational coupling on the current density (per quasi-particle energy) along with associated limitations of interpretations within a simple Landauer-Büttiker-type description, please see, for example, P. Hyldgaard, S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **236**, 1 (1994), and H. Ness, L. K. Dash, and R. W. Godby, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 085426 (2010).

[83] N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 5335 (1995).

[84] M. Di Ventra, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 139902(E) (2002); M. Di Ventra, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 979 (2000).

[85] M. Brandbyge, J. L. Mozos, P. Ordejón, J. Taylor, and K. Stokbro, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165401 (2002); E. Artacho, J. D. Gale, A. Garcia, J. Junquera, P. Ordejón, and D. Sánchez-Portal, J. Phys. C **14**, 2745 (2002).

[86] J. Enkovaara, C. Rostgaard, J. J. Mortensen, J. Chen, M. Dulak, L. Ferrighi, J. Gavnholt, C. Glinsvad, V. Haikola, H. A. Hansen, H. H. Kristoffersen, M. Kuisma, A. H. Larsen, L. Lehtovaara, M. Ljungberg, O. Lopez-Acevedo, P. G. Moses, J. Ojanen, T. Olsen, V. Petzold, N. A. Romero, J. Stausholm-Møller, M. Strange, G. A. Tritsaris, M. Vanin, M. Walter, B. Hammer, H. Häkkinen, G. K. H. Madsen, R. M. Nieminen, J. K. Nørskov, M. Puska, T. T. Rantala, J. Schiøtz, K. S. Thygesen and K. W. Jacobsen,

J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **22**, 3202 (2010); M. Strange, I. S. Kristensen, K. S. Thygesen, and K. W. Jacobsen, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 4714 (2008).

[87] For an example of significant bias-induced enhancement of electron-electron scattering in a resonant-tunneling (quantum-cascade-laser) system, please see P. Hyldgaard and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 6889 (1996).

[88] A. Wacker, A.-P. Jauho, S. Zeuner, and S. J. Allen, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 13268 (1997); A. Wacker and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 369 (1998); S. C. Lee and A. Wacker, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 245314 (2002); C. Weber, A. Wacker, A. Knorr, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 165322 (2009).

[89] P. Havu, V. Havu, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 115325 (2004); P. Havu, M. J. Puska, R. M. Nieminen, and V. Havu, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 233308 (2004); P. Havu, N. Tuomisto, R. Väänänen, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 235301 (2005).

[90] M. H. Hettler, W. Wenzel, M. R. Wegewijs, and H. Schoeller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 076805 (2003); C. Romeike, M. R. Wegewijs, W. Hofstetter, and H. Schoeller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 196601 (2006).

[91] K. S. Thygesen and K. W. Jacobsen, Chem. Phys. **319**, 146801 (2005); K. S. Thygesen, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 035309 (2006); K. S. Thygesen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 166804 (2008).

[92] M. F. Gelin, D. S. Kosov, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 011116 (2008).

[93] M. F. Gelin, D. S. Kosov, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 022101 (2009).

[94] N. Lanatà, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 195326 (2010).

[95] I note that the combined NEGF and time-dependent DFT study, Ref. 25, demonstrated how the entropy flow caused the time-dependent tunneling behavior to approach a steady-state behavior under a number of initial starting conditions.

[96] Clearly, tunneling in a system, described by a time-independent scattering potential need not always have stationary electron dynamics. As also discussed in Ref. 28, a time-dependent tunneling behavior can arise through an intermittent behavior, for example, in an ordinary avalanche diode.

[97] Eugene Merzbacher, *Quantum Mechanics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York), p. 41.

[98] T. B. Grimley, Proc. Phys. Soc. **90**, 751 (1967).

[99] T. L. Einstein and J. R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 3629 (1973); T. L. Einstein, Surf. Sci. **75**, L497 (1978); T. L. Einstein in *Handbook of Surface Science, Vol. 1*, ed W. Unertl (Elsevier Science, 1996), ch. 11.

[100] H. Lau and W. Kohn, Surf. Sci. **75**, 69 (1978).

[101] P. Hyldgaard and M. Persson, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **12**, L13 (2000).

[102] P. Hyldgaard and T. L. Einstein, Europhys. Lett. **59**, 265 (2002).

[103] J. Repp, F. Moresco, G. Meyer, K.-H. Rieder, P. Hyldgaard, and M. Persson, Phys. Rev. Lett **85**, 2981 (2000).

[104] P. Hyldgaard, unpublished.

[105] J. Harris, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 1770 (1985).

[106] In writing Ref. 101 attention was given to express the formal similarities between moving to a canonical-ensemble evaluation and to retaining the equilibrium Gibbs free energy term in the Harris scheme adapted for the GCE thermodynamical DFT.[16] On the one hand, the stated form of the one-electron contribution, Eq. (4) in Ref. 101 can be viewed simply as an adjustment of the Fermi level, same as is discussed, for example, in Ref. 98. On the other hand, that form of the one-electron contribution is *also* an inclusion of the Gibbs free energy term in an open-boundary thermodynamics evaluation consistent with Mermin's equilibrium thermodynamics DFT.[16] Either way, this careful handling of the implications of Freidel sum rule plays a vital role in getting the $1/d^2$ assumptotic decay of the oscillatory interaction.[103]

[107] S. P. Hershfield, private communication.

[108] D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. **150**, 516 (1966).

[109] B. A. Lippmann and J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **79**, 469 (1950).

[110] Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX.

[111] For example, J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3865 (1996).

[112] For example, A. Tkatchenko, L. Romaner, O. Hoffman, E. Zojer, C. Ambrosch-Draxl, and M. Scheffler, MRS Bul. **35**, 435 (2010); S. Grimme, Comput. Mol. Sci. **1**, 211 (2011).

[113] R. Ahlrichs, R. Penco, and G. Scoles, Chem. Phys. **19**, 119 (1977); Q. Wu and W. Yang, J. Chem. Phys. **116**, 515 (2002); S. Grimme, J. Comput. Chem. **25**, 1463 (2004); P. Jurecka, J. Cerny, P. Hobza, and D. R. Salahub, J. Comput. Chem. **28**, 555 (2007); S. Grimme, J. Antony, T. Schwabe, and C. Mück-Lichentenfeld, Org. Biomol. Chem. **5**, 741 (2007): C. Morgado, M. A. Vincent, I. H. Hiller, and X. Shan, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **9** 448 (2007); M. Pavone, N. Rega, and V. Barone, Chem. Phys. Lett. **452**, 333 (2008); A. Tkatchenko and M. Scheffler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 073005 (2009); F. O. Kannemann and A. D. Becke, J. Chem. Theory and Comput., **6**, 1081 (2010); S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich, and H. Krieg, J. Chem. Phys. **132**, 1541004 (2010); and references therein.

[114] W. Kohn, Y. Meir, D. E. Makarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4153 (1998), S. Kurth and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 10461 (1999); J. F. Dobson and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2123 (1999); J. F. Dobson and B. P. Dinte, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1780 (1996); J. M. Pitarke and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 045101 (2003); O. A. Vydrov and T. Van Voorhis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 063004 (2009); O. A. Vydrov and T. Van Voorhis, J. Chem. Phys. **133**, 244103 (2010).

[115] H. Rydberg, B. I. Lundqvist, D. C. Langreth, and M. Dion, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 6997 (2000); H. Rydberg, M. Dion, N. Jacobson, E. Schröder, P. Hyldgaard, S.I. Simak, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 126402 (2003); M. Dion, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 246401 (2004); M. Dion, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 109902(E) (2005); G. Román-Peréz, and J. M. Soler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 096102 (2009); A. Gulans, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 201105 (2009); V. R. Cooper, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 161104 (2010); J. Klimes, D. R. Bowler, and A. Michaelides, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **22**, 022201 (2010); K. Lee, E. D. Murray, L. Kong, B. I. Lundqvist, and D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 081101(R) (2010).

[116] T. Thonhauser, V. R. Cooper, S. Li, A. Puzder, P. Hyldgaard, and D.C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 125112 (2007).

[117] L. Bartels, Nature Chem. **2**, 87 (2010).

[118] For examples of nonempirical studies of molecular-overlayer interaction problems, please see, e.g., P. Sony, P. Puschnig, D. Nabok, and C. Ambrosch-Draxl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 176401 (2007); K. Johnston, J. Kleis, B. I. Lundqvist, and R. M. Nieminen, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 121404 (2008); K. Berland, T.L. Einstein, and P. Hyldgaard, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 155431 (2009); K. Toyoda, Y. Nakano, I. Hamada, K. Lee, S. Yanagisawa, and Y. Morikawa, Surf. Science **603**, 2912 (2009); P.G. Moses, J. J. Mortensen, B. I. Lundqvist, and J. K. Nørskov, J. Chem. Phys. **130**, 104709 (2009); C. J. Villagomez, O. Guillermet, S. Goudeau, F. Ample, H. Xu, C. Coudret, X. Bouju, T. Zambelli, and S. Gauthier, J. Chem. Phys. **132**, 074705 (2010); L. Zoppi, A. Garcia, and K. K. Baldridge, J. Phys. Chem. **114**, 8864 (2010); K. Lee, Y. Morikawa, and D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 155461 (2010); H. Ruuska, E. Arola, T. Kortelainen, T. T. Rantala, T. Tapio, K. Kannus, and S. Valkealahti, J Chem Phys. **134**, 134904 (2011); J. Klimes, D. R. Bowler, and A. Michaelides, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 195131 (2011).

[119] An example of a van der Waals interaction study for larger-scale molecular-overlayer assembly is included in J. Wyrick, D.-H. Kim, D. Sun, Z. Cheng, W. Lu, Y. Zhu, K. Berland, Y. S. Kim, E. Rotenberg, M. Luo, P. Hyldgaard, T. L. Einstein, and L. Bartels, Nano Letters **11**, 2944 (2011).

[120] For formulations based on renormalization group theory, see, for example, F. B. Anders and A. Schiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 196801 (2005); F. B. Anders and A. Schiller, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 245113 (2006).

[121] For formulations based on Lindblad functional see, for example, S. W. Gao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3101 (1997); P. Saalfrank, Chem. Rev. **106**, 4116 (2006).

[122] A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1821 (1996).

[123] A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. B **62**, R16271 (2000).

[124] D. C. Langreth, *Theory of polaron mobility,* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois, 1964).

[125] N. S. Wingreen, A.-P. Jauho, and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. B **48**, R8487 (1993); A.-P. Jauho, N. S. Wingreen, and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 5528 (1994).

[126] H. Mera and Y. M. Niquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 216408 (2010).

[127] G. Vignale and M. DiVentra, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 014201 (2009).

[128] H. Mera, P. Bokes, and R. W. Godby, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 125319 (2007).

[129] P. Nordlander, M. Pustilnik, Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 808 (1999); M. Plihal, D. C. Langreth, and P. Nordlander, Phys. Rev. B **61**, R13341 (2000); P. Nordlander, N. S. Wingreen, Y. Meir, and D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2146 (2000); M. Plihal, D. C. Langreth, and P. Nordlander, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 165321 (2005).

[130] J. B. Neaton, M. S. Hybertsen, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 216405 (2006).

[131] K. Kaasberg and K. Flensberg, Nano Lett. **8**, 3809 (2008).

[132] K. S. Thygesen and A. Rubio, J. Chem. Phys. **126**, 091101 (2007); K. S. Thygesen and A. Rubio, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 115333 (2008).

[133] P. Myohanen, A. Stan, G. Stefanucci, and R. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 115107 (2009).

[134] For example, E. K. U. Gross, J. F. Dobson, and M. Petersilka, in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), p. 96.

[135] M. Koentopp, C. Chang, K. Burke, and R. Car, J. Phys.:Condens. Mat. **20**, 083203 (2008).

[136] One can demonstrate Ehrenfest theorem for an isolated equilibrium system by first utilizing the standard Green theorem, then assume an infinite repetition, and finally employ the perodic-cell Green's theorem, Neil W. Ashcroft and N. David Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1976,) p. 772.

[137] Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX, section 3.

[138] Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX, section 29.

[139] The role of the Green-theorem surface terms (in a consistent determination of noninteracting Green's functions for tunneling[71]) is seldom expressed but they are nevertheless essential[77] (unless we include MB scattering and associated dephasing effects everywhere). In the NEGF descriptions, we traditionally seek to separate the perturbing single-particle terms (for example, changes in the kinetic energy and in an external potential and here denoted δKV) for which we require an exact treatment, *plus* remaining terms (MB interactions and, possibly, potential fluctuations) for which we often seek a systematic approximation described by self-energy terms σ. I denote the Greens' function of the full (H) and initial (H_d) Hamiltonian by g and g^d, respectively. For bulk systems, the presence of dephasing mechanisms makes it correct to express the less-than function $g_< = g_r\sigma_< g_a$, i.e., in a form where the δKV perturbation are exactly treated and are entirely included in $g_{<,r,a}$. However, this formulation obviously fails in the case of noninteracting tunneling[77] (where $\sigma \equiv 0$). For the typical NEGF study of tunneling with no MB interactions in the leads the Green-theorem surface terms require, instead, that we work with the more complete expression[77] $g_< = [1 + g_r(\delta KV + \sigma_r)]g^d_<[(\delta KV + \sigma_a)g_a + 1] + g_r\sigma_< g_a$. While many NEGF descriptions choose to formally set a lead self-energy term, using $g_< \equiv g_r(\sigma_< + \Sigma_<^{\text{leads}})g_a$, it is still the Green-theorem surface terms which ensure a consistent formulation of the tunneling.[77]

[140] A. van der Ziel, *Noise in Solid State Devices and Curcuits,* (Wiley, Ney York, 1986).

[141] Early NEGF and scattering-state formulations[71,80,81] was soon supplemented by a masters-equation approach[140] to explore (NEQ) noise signatures of interaction effects in, for example, resonant and Coulomb-blockade tunneling, J. H. Davies, S. Hershfield, P. Hyldgaard, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 9620 (1992); S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, P. Hyldgaard, C. J. Stanton, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 1967 (1993).

[142] Hershfield and others term the electron-redistribution operator '$\hat{Y}$'. Here it is here labeled by a subscript 'LS' to emphasize that it and the NEQ steady-state density matrix solution (9) are exactly related to the formal Lippmann-Schwinger (LS) solution[109] for MB collision problems.

[143] In fact, the steady-state ReNQSM[67,107] contains an explicit construction of the operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}$ which is order-by-

order in the perturbation term (which includes the external potential). This construction strongly suggests that it is impossible to ignore an explicit dependence on the nuclei positions in the resulting operator $\hat{Y}_{\rm LS}$.

[144] It is possible to link the LSC-DFT[28] with the present NEQ thermodynamic account because one can make compatible choices in the details of adiabatic turn on and thus satisfy even stringent mathematical conditions. On physical grounds it is clear that any extremely soft modification of distant-past details in the form of adiabatic turn on can have no consequences because of the inherent entropy flows which characterize the open tunneling systems. Appendix B provides details on the mathematical issues and a rigorous proof that one can ensure compatibility between the LSC-DFT description and the present NEQ thermodynamic theory (or, in fact, any QKA method).

[145] J. Pirenne, Helv. Phys. Acta **21**, 226 (1948); J. Pirenne, Phys. Rev. **86**, 395 (1952).

[146] F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. **75**, 486 (1949).

[147] M. Gellmann and M. L. Goldberger, Phys. Rev. **91**, 398 (1953).

[148] B. S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. **100**, 905 (1955).

[149] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (3rd Edition, Part 1, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980), pp. 158-159.

[150] I stress that identical continuum Caroli partition schemes[62,63] are used in the LSC-DFT paper[28] (for a uniqueness of density proof) and in the present study of thermodynamic study. Given a discusion of the details of the adiabatic turn on,[144] the LSC-DFT argument[28] for uniqueness of density applies *verbatim* also for the present investigation of thermodynamics.

[151] For traditional time-dependent DFT calculations, where one can assume a finite extension of the system and hence system-specific potential, there exists a proof of uniqueness of density, R. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3863 (1999).

[152] There is no rigorous argument for assuming that the proof of time-dependent DFT (TD-DFT) V-representatibility[151] also extents to transport calculations based on infinite-system TD-DFT[25], to LSC-DFT[28] or (via the LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density) to the here-presented construction of thermodynamic density functional. Given a finite support of the system-specific single-particle potential, it is not clear that one can represent all changes in density variations arising also outside that potential support. However, since the support can be made much larger than the extension of the actually laboratory and much larger than any four-probe measurement setup, I here follow a practice of simply assuming that there exists an approximative V-representatibility. I stress that such an assumption is exclusively relevant *when* seeking a density functional description of the thermodynamics of tunneling.

[153] P. Lloyds, Proc. Phys. Soc. **90**, 207 (1967).

[154] K. Berland, T. L. Einstein, and P. Hyldgaard, “Response of the Shockley surface state to an external electrical field: A density-functional theory study of Cu(111),” submitted to Phys. Rev. B, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.6706.`

[155] M. J. Lighthill, “Introduction to Fourier analysis and generalized functions” (Cambridge University Press, London, 1964).